

[12th December 1923]

IV

HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I have to inform the House that the following six gentlemen have been nominated for election to the House Committee:—

Mr. P. T. Rajan.	Mr. J. A. Davis.
„ A. V. Bhanoji Rao.	„ R. Veerian.
„ V. Madhava Raja.	„ Abdul Hye Sahib.

As the number of candidates for election is equal to the number of vacancies to be filled, viz., six, I hereby declare the abovementioned gentlemen to have been duly elected under Regulation II (4) of the Regulations for the holding of elections by means of Single Transferable Vote."

V

ELECTION OF TWELVE MEMBERS TO THE SENATE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"With reference to the point raised on the 20th November 1923 in regard to the election of twelve members to the Senate of the Madras University by means of the Single Transferable Vote, I have to inform the House that the hon. the Advocate-General, who was consulted, shares the view expressed by the hon. the Law Member, that, inasmuch as the Madras University Act prescribed election according to the principle of proportionate representation by means of the Single Transferable Vote only for the constituency of registered graduates, the same method cannot be followed in election by any other electorate under the same Act. Having regard to this opinion I have decided that the non-official Members of this Council should elect their twelve representatives to the Senate in one of the ordinary modes. There are two alternative methods: one will be to vote by ballot at a meeting of the House, and the other, to vote by post. It seems to me that the latter method may preferably be adopted in the present case. I accordingly prescribe 3 p.m. on the 22nd December as the latest time at which nominations of candidates will be received by the Secretary. If they are not delivered in person, they should be sent to him by registered post, so as to reach him not later than the 22nd December. If the number of candidates exceeds the number of vacancies (12), he will at once get voting papers prepared and sent to hon. Members by post. Voting papers should be either delivered to the Secretary in person or sent by post so as to reach him before 3 p.m. on the 10th January 1924."

VI

MOTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION—*cont.*

The Council then resumed discussion on the above Motion.*

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, in rising to support this Motion I wish to state clearly at the outset that I do not treat this as a party question at all. I am glad that my Friend Mr. Satyamurti who moved this Resolution emphasized that point and appealed to the hon. Members of this House to treat this from a non-party

* That this Council recommends to the Government of Madras that it should withdraw from any further participation in the British Empire Exhibition of 1924 to be held in London.

12th December 1923] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

point of view. Persons belonging to all classes of political thought in India—Moderates, Liberals and Extremists; Brahmans and non-Brahmans; Hindus and non-Hindus—are all agreed on this question. The object of this Empire Exhibition, Sir, is to demonstrate the commercial and industrial greatness and possibilities of the Empire. If we refuse to participate in this Exhibition the place allotted for the Indian exhibits will remain vacant. This must necessarily draw the attention of all those who visit the Exhibition, of the Members of the British Cabinet, of the people of England and of the Empire, nay, of the whole world. And that will also bring home to all people our sense of injury, humiliation and helplessness. No doubt, about a year and a half ago, this Council voted a large sum of money to be spent for the purposes of this Exhibition. But since then important events have happened. The British Cabinet have given their decision on the question of Kenya, and since the date at which this Council voted that sum, the Resolution of 1921, which was passed by the Imperial Conference proclaiming to the world that India was an equal partner in the British Commonwealth, and that Indians had equal treatment in the colonies, has been cast to the winds. In Kenya itself, though the railway of the country has been built by Indian labour, and though the government of that country is carried on even now with the help of the industry and intelligence of the Indian subordinates of the Government, Indians have no honourable place. Though the Indians have settled down in the country for about 300 years long before any white settler thought of going to that country, Indians are treated in Kenya as helots. Even the view of the Ministers of the British Cabinet on the question of segregation in the municipal town and emigration, though it looks forcible on the paper, has been whittled down. No doubt we have already spent a sum of 25 thousand rupees on this Exhibition and commitments have already been made to the extent of larger amounts, I dare say probably legal liabilities have also been incurred. These, I submit, Sir, should not stand in the way of our supporting this Resolution. Strong diseases require strong remedies. The occasion is a unique one. It is one in which our national honour is involved, and this Council should be prepared to vote the amount which will be necessary for meeting the legal liabilities, if any, that have been incurred.

“The object of the Exhibition is to glorify the Empire. We have no place in that Empire. The Indians have no place in the Empire. The coloured races have no place in the Empire. It is purely a white Empire, and I am firmly of opinion that we, Indians, should not take part in the glorification of that Empire by participating in its Exhibition.

“No doubt by our refusal to take part in this Exhibition we shall not be able to prevent in any way the utility of this Empire Exhibition. We shall not be able in any way to diminish or to reduce the splendour and greatness of this Exhibition. But by our refusal to take part in it, we shall be able to show to the world that we can resent the treatment that is accorded to us; we shall show that we refuse to be willing and consenting partners to insult and humiliation. I do not think that the occasion requires a long speech. With these few words, I support the Motion.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—“Sir, I request permission to move an Amendment to this Resolution, viz,—

In line 2 omit the words ‘withdraw from any further participation in’ and substitute therefor the following words:—‘incur no further liability in connexion with.’

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [12th December 1923]

“The Resolution with my Amendment would read thus :

‘That this Council recommends to the Government of Madras that it should incur no further liability in connexion with the British Empire Exhibition of 1924 to be held in London.’”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“I object to this Amendment under Standing Order 60 (1). Sir, you can suspend the Standing Order and give leave to move this Amendment, but I humbly submit to you, that this is not a case in which you will suspend the Standing Order ; because, I submit that the Amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar, is merely a clever ruse, if I may use the phrase, to save the face of the Government, after having noted the feeling of the House when I moved the Resolution yesterday. I am sure I am going to carry this Resolution in spite of the legal liabilities the House has to consider. I submit that I and this House are entitled to some notice on the matter, especially when my hon. Friend could have already seen the Resolution on the Agenda. I therefore request you in all humility not to suspend the Standing Order.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“Mr. President, may I point out before you give your ruling that an exactly identical Resolution is on the Agenda paper, i.e., Resolution No. 27, of which notice has been given by Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, namely,

‘That this Council recommends to the Government that no further expenses be incurred by it in connexion with the Empire Exhibition.’

“It is merely a chance that the hon. the learned Member for the University was able to draw an earlier lot for his Resolution on the subject. If Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar’s Resolution had been moved, there would have been no question of saving the face of the Government or the Ministers or the Ministerialist Party of the House.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Let me say at once that there is no question of suspending the Standing Order 60 (1). Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar has not made a request to me to suspend that Order.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“I intended to request you to suspend the Standing Order and to allow me to move the Amendment.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I suspend the Standing Order and allow the Amendment to go forward.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, my Friend has appealed in moving this Resolution that the whole House shall consider it above all party considerations and as a matter affecting the honour of this country. I, for one, agree with him in the appeal that he has made, and I hope also that this Amendment that has been tabled will be appreciated by him as having been given in the spirit in which he has appealed to the House to view the question. But in proposing the Amendment, my object is to show that we should not place ourselves, in a moment of anger or heat that we may feel with reference to this question, or place the Government, the country, and those who have entered into agreement with the Government in a false position. It is to save the false position, but at the same time to enable the House to express in unmistakable terms, the feeling of resentment, indignation and disgust at the way in which our countrymen in the colonies are being treated by those who, at one time, during the crisis and stress of war, when our men and money and material resources were required and placed at their

12th December 1923] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

disposal, proclaimed to the world that we were partners in the world confederation, that we were partners in the British Dominions, and that we were men of equal status and of equal rank as the Britisher. Now, when the war is over—and human memory is weak—our countrymen are treated like helots. They are treated not as equal partners but, if I may use that expression, one as a dominant partner and the other as a subservient one, one as the master and the other as the servant. It is but right that when an opportunity occurs, when we are asked to associate ourselves in any common venture with the colonials, we should show our resentment at the way in which our countrymen are treated, and being branded as infamous or inferior people. Sir, to this extent I agree with my hon. Friend, Mr. Satyamurti. It is our right and our duty to express our feelings of indignation, but as to the methods proposed I beg to differ a little from him. If I may use an expression that is ordinarily used in the Courts of Law, if for the first time the subject whether we should participate in the British Empire Exhibition were brought before us, that is to say, if we were not bound by anything that we have done in the past, by decisions or advice which this House as other responsible Houses or Provincial Councils and the Imperial Assembly have given to their respective Governments previously, then the only course open to us is to say decidedly 'No' to this invitation. But this invitation was extended to us about a year and a half ago. I remember my Friend, Mr. Rangachariar, speaking at the Delhi Assembly—I happened to be there then—protested against participation. But his view changed. Speaking in July 1922, at the meeting convened by His Excellency the Governor, Mr. Rangachariar said that it would be a great advantage if we sent our exhibits to the Empire Exhibition in 1924. Such changes have come.

11-30 a.m. "When the Resolution as to whether we should participate in the Exhibition was discussed at the meeting held in September 1922, my hon. Friend, Mr. Narasimhacharlu, had in view this question of the differential treatment meted out to us, Indians, in the Colonies. My Friend, Mr. Krishna Rao, also referred to the fact that a deputation had gone to the Colonies headed by the Right hon. Srinivasa Sastri. Let us wait and see whether things would not improve. It was not that we were unaware of this problem that was confronting Indians in Kenya. We only hoped that the decision then taken was the decision of the recalcitrant children of the Motherland, and it was not the decision taken by the Mother country as a whole. We all hoped that the Mother country's influence would be exerted to correct the erring children, the erring daughters, who were not prepared to allow their sister dependency, India, to have equal privileges with themselves. But since we decided to participate and authorized the respective Governments to enter into engagements, the British Cabinet has given its decision which has taken us by surprise. It is a decision which does not express disapproval, but it practically amounts to an approval of the conduct of the colonials. So, owing to all these happenings, our view has been changed. But we, Sir, have to consider what the effect of our total withdrawal from participation would be. It is not that we delight in the participation, not that I have any glamour for the very large wealth that may be ensured to India by her participation. I do agree with my hon. Friend, Mr. Satyamurti, that national honour is much more valuable than national wealth, which may be obtained by participation (hear, hear). But, at the same time, we who ask for responsible Government should also have a sense of responsibility in the

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiya] [12th December 1923]

advice that we give to the Government. Can we afford, Sir, after having allowed the Government to enter into commitments such as the hiring of land, which I take it is six grounds, or which comes to 12,500 square feet, at the rate of 12 shillings a square foot which comes to a total amount of Rs. 1,35,000, can we afford to say that we shall not take up the land? My Friend, Mr. Satyamurti, is a lawyer, and knows that whether he makes use of the land during the time the Exhibition is held or not, his legal liability is there and it must be discharged. He knows also that various producers and manufacturers of articles who intended to exhibit them by reason of the commitments which this House has given for accommodating them and giving them facilities for transporting their goods, might have asked for reserved space which must have been provided for them by the various shipping companies. And shipping companies are not going to excuse the Government of the latter's non-utilization of the space reserved for them. There is that liability, and we have made ourselves bailees for carrying and transporting the various wares intended to be exhibited there. Naturally those who have entrusted them are expecting that the wares would be exhibited for their own benefit, and they would expect us to carry out our engagements. These and various others are the commitments by which we have bound Government by reason of the policy which we have adopted. So, under these circumstances, however much we may regret that we are pledged to participate in the Exhibition, we think that we are not to submit the Government to claims for damages which are likely to arise from several quarters. Though we may not feel enthusiastic over the participation, we shall not authorize a breach of contract as it was entered into by the Government by virtue of the mandate given them by the Resolution of the House passed in September 1922. Under these circumstances, it is only for the purpose of avoiding legal complications which are sure to arise by reason of any decision that may be given contrary to an undertaking given in the past, that I make a modification that we do ratify it only to the extent of the liabilities that have already been entered into, and mark our displeasure, disapproval, and condemnation of the treatment meted out to us in the Colonies. Thus far shall we go and no further. So, with these words, Sir, I commend for the acceptance of this House my Amendment which seems to be a *via media* between total withdrawal and complete participation."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I rise to second the Amendment.

"There is not one Member who does not share the sentiments given expression to in this House, who does not resent the injustice done to his countrymen in Kenya as an injustice done to himself, who does not feel the humiliation imposed upon his countrymen in Kenya as a humiliation inflicted on himself, and who does not consider the refusal to concede equal rights to his countrymen in Kenya as diminishing, as it were, the rights which he himself enjoys in this country. Whatever political views he may hold, whatever political party he may belong to, whatever religion he may profess, as an Indian, he cannot but share these sentiments. Our countrymen in Kenya, though they may be separated by the broad seas, are still the bone of our bone and the blood of our blood and what affects them cannot be a matter of indifference to the Members of this House and to the people of this province and country. If, at the same time, I wish to have clear information and if I wish to second the Amendment moved by my Friend, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiya, it is because I owe a duty as a Member of this Council, and I feel

12th December 1923] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

that, as a responsible Member who had warmly supported the Resolution for holding the Empire Exhibition a year and a half ago, I must proceed very carefully realizing my duties as a Member of this Council. The hon. the Mover of this Amendment spoke of certain commitments and obligations. Yesterday in this Council, in answer to a question we were told that Rs. 55,000 and odd had already been spent. At the same time, the hon. Member Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu said that the Government was probably committed to certain obligations. It is very desirable that we should know what these commitments and obligations are and what their nature and extent are. If it is true that Government have entered into legal obligations as my hon. Friend suggested, if they have made promises, then certainly these promises have to be kept. If they are not kept, the Government will be subjected to unnecessary and vexatious litigation; they may be subjected to law suits for breach of trust or breach of contract. Is it desirable that in the face of all these difficulties we should place Government in that embarrassing and awkward situation and make ducks of the tax-payers' money?

"Secondly, Sir, whatever differences of opinion there may exist with regard to this Empire Exhibition, viewed as a business proposition—some contending that participation in this Exhibition might result in British capital flowing into this country and the Englishman being allowed to exploit our resources, others maintaining that it is not an altogether unmixed blessing to attract capital and to allow the Englishman to show us the way and help us in the development of the resources of our province, some holding that it is desirable to have European markets for Indian goods and even raw materials, because Indians are sure to realize large profits by selling these raw materials there, others maintaining that in the interests of the economic prosperity of this province it would be most advantageous that those raw materials should be retained here and made use of—whatever differences of opinion there may exist on this question, it seems to me that it is not altogether a safe and sound policy to mix together the two branches of politics and trade which must be kept distinct and separate. Is it absolutely necessary for us to drag in politics into a sphere which is one purely of trade? And again, cannot trade be made use of as an effective weapon for achieving the very purpose sought to be achieved by this motion in this Council, effective in the sense that if all Indian exhibitors refuse to participate in the Exhibition and are prepared to forego their claims, there would be no participation and we would be free from all liability, effective also in another sense, that of making use of trade for preventing imports from those Dominions which are markedly hostile to the political aims and aspirations of our countrymen in Kenya.

"Thirdly, an hon. Member said the hands of our esteemed countryman, Dr. Sapru, were strengthened by a message sent by His Excellency the Viceroy. All Indians are agreed in regarding the work done by Dr. Sapru as altogether invaluable. He has made heroic efforts to champion the cause of Indians, and by his sincerity and earnestness has even brought about a change of mind. His Excellency the Viceroy's Government have spared no pains to champion the Indian cause, and as constitutionally they are not in a position to force their opinion upon the Dominions, they did what was possible for them, that is, they made suitable representations to the Cabinet."

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Sir, my hon. Friend seems to be going off the rails altogether. The Kenya decision was arrived at by the British Cabinet and not on the representations of the Government of Madras,"

[12th December 1923]

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—“ My esteemed Friend has not understood me. I am speaking here of the co-operation of the Viceregal Government and I am going to say that the Madras Government also co-operated in making representations to the Cabinet. That is precisely what I am going to say, that His Excellency Lord Willingdon's Government have not been behind any other Provincial Government in joining hands with the Viceregal Government and seeing that a very good impression was made on the Cabinet, and that the Cabinet gave a favourable verdict. I think by adopting the Amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, we will be really strengthening the arms of Dr. Sapru. If I make use of an expression just now used by my hon. Friend there on the Opposite benches, Dr. Sapru himself is for discrimination. As regards the expression used, namely, boycott of imports, he (Dr. Sapru) wants us to boycott the imports only of one colony, South Africa, which has been so markedly, frankly and brutally hostile to India's interests. I, for one, am prepared, like every true Indian, to put the right foot forward and do all that a Councillor may do. If I second the Amendment just now moved, it is because of these implications, especially the legal liabilities, involved. With these few words, I second the amendment.”

11-45 a.m. The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The amendment before the House is :—

‘ In line 2, omit the words “ withdraw from any further participation in ” and substitute therefor the words “ incur no further liability in connexion with ” ’.

“ The Motion will then read as follows :—

‘ That this Council recommends to the Government of Madras that it should incur no further liability in connexion with the British Empire Exhibition of 1924 to be held in London. ’ ”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I cannot sufficiently express my gratitude to hon. Members on the other side of the House who have so nobly responded, if I may say so respectfully, to the humble call of patriotism which was sounded yesterday by means of my Resolution. I am very glad indeed that they have taken this Resolution in this spirit, as one which is above all parties and have practically conceded the soundness and the validity of every argument that I advanced in support of my Resolution. Indeed, my hon. Friend, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, was, in parts even stronger than I was, in moving his Amendment to the Resolution before this House. But, if I am grateful to them for that very generous gesture on their part, I am very sorry indeed, Mr. President, that I cannot see my way to accept the Amendment. I owe it to him, and I owe it to this House, that I must say why I, and those who think and act with me, will not be in a position to accept this Amendment. For one thing, Sir, as my hon. Friend there who seconded the Amendment himself admitted, no one in this House knows definitely or accurately what these unspent liabilities are, how much of them has been incurred, and on what account. Therefore, Sir, the amendment, for one thing, is very vague. It may mean too much; it may mean too little; nobody knows. But, apart from that, Sir, I wish to assure my hon. Friend that when I framed this Resolution, it was not in a moment of anger or of heat. Many long months have elapsed, and as month after month passes, the heart only gets the more lacerated. There is no anger or heat in it. There is this continuous challenge to our national self-respect and we are

12th December 1923] [Mr. S. Satyamurti]

only anxious that we must do something to vindicate that self-respect. I entirely agree with my Friend that nobody in this House wants to place the Government in a false position. I am not anxious that the Government of Madras should enter the precincts of courts as defendants in suits for moneys for freight or other charges incurred. My hon. Friend who moved the Amendment is himself a lawyer and he knows that no Resolution of this House really may be an answer to liabilities which have already been incurred. Therefore, Sir, my Resolution does not, and did not, contemplate the idea that any liabilities so far incurred should not be respected as they ought to be. Therefore, it is wholly an irrelevant consideration.

"The point before the House is whether we should, to the extent to which we can influence the decision of the Government, permit the Government to take formal part in the British Empire Exhibition. My Resolution is indicative of the anxiety of Indians of all shades of political opinion, and I am glad that we all here do not want to have any part or lot in the Exhibition. Why, Sir, speaking for myself, if I am asked to vote 50 lakhs and be let off without having to take part in this humiliating exhibition, for myself, I am perfectly agreeable to that course. After all . . ."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"May I enquire, Sir, whether he speaks for himself, or whether he is saying that on behalf of the Government?"

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"I do not understand the joke of it, Sir. I am speaking as an elected Member of this Council, as much as my hon. Friend himself is, and I am telling him, and I am telling this House, that if any amount has to be paid for and that a sum of 50 lakhs represents that amount, I would rather pay that and be done with it. If it is a question of taking part in the Exhibition, Mr. President, the dignity and the greatness of India require that we should spend as much as we can. I would rather not put this question at all. Do we want that India should go there and add to her humiliation by having unfinished pandals, unfinished exhibits and things coming on the way? I do not see the rationale of that at all. Either go there, or do not go there, and, if we go there, have we not got that additional responsibility of the honour of this beautiful country? Let us not be willing to wound, but afraid to strike and say 'We will pay you whatever you have incurred?' That is unmanly. I think it is not right. It will be again wounding to the pride of India. The hon. the Mover of the amendment said: 'We are bound by what we have done in the past'. I have closely followed the elections to the Assembly, Mr. President, as I am sure everyone here has, and, unless something very unexpected happens, I expect that next January, when the Assembly meets, there will be a Resolution which will be passed, withdrawing all participation in the Empire Exhibition. I know the Members there. Therefore, Sir, being the first Council who are meeting on this question and discussing it, let us give a manly lead to the country on this matter.

"Then, Sir, we are told that we have already spent money upon it and that we must not lose it. To that my answer is 'Who steals my purse steals trash. It was something, it is nothing. It was mine. It is his and has been slave to thousands. But he who robs me of my good name robs me of that which not enriches him, but leaves me poor indeed'. Am I going to be allowed to be exhibited as a slave before the British Empire Exhibition because I have spent money upon it?"

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[12th December 1923]

"Then, Sir, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar told us that as people working for Responsible Government, we ought to vote for his Amendment. What a petty reason, Mr. President, I ask the hon. the Mover of the amendment? Do you think that any man of any nation in this world which is self-governing, will be treated as fit to have Responsible Government when you are willing to take insults lying down and calculate rupees, annas and pies when questions of national honour are concerned? I would rather, Sir, that this House would stand as a man and stand for Responsible Government by voting for my Resolution and against the Amendment. It is not by these methods that nations are built. Nations are not built in counting-houses. Nations are built in temples where the goddess of honour is worshipped and where national self-respect is exalted. I invite my Friend, therefore, Sir, to shed all considerations based upon filthy lucre, to stand up as an outraged man with dignity in the face and tell the British Empire: 'Whatever you may do, or whatever you may not do, so long as you do not give us a place in your Empire, we will not willingly take part in your Exhibition. Enough unto your Exhibition and for the day.'

"Then, Sir, we have been told that lands have been taken, that shipping freights have been paid and that private persons have been asked to do various things. Indeed, Mr. President, if there is land taken, and if the land is left vacant there, there may be no greater, no more significant, reminder to the crowds that will go to Wembley and that will gaze at the vacant site, that India is not here because her children are weeping. Surely we do not want any greater vindication of India's manhood. I, therefore, trust, Mr. President, that we shall not be drawn by this red herring of saying 'No further liabilities', which may mean anything, or which may mean nothing. But what we want is that the Government of Madras, to the extent to which we can bind their hands, shall notify to all whom it may concern, from Mr. Baldwin or whoever may be the next Premier down to the Governor of Madras, that we shall not have anything to do with this British Empire Exhibition. Thereby we shall be showing our true loyalty to the Empire. It does not consist in sycophant praise of the Empire, but in manly assertion of our dignity. We shall be true to the British Government in India, because I know they are fighting on this question. Now, Sir, Government servants are not able to speak out their minds, but if they can, I am certain that the two Indian Members on the Treasury bench there will feel with me if only they are able to lay their hearts on the table. I have no doubt, therefore, that whatever officials may or may not be able to do, we non-officials, who represent the public outside, let us hear the voice of the wounded nation outside asking for redress. I therefore ask my Friends and this House to vote against the Amendment."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I have also great pleasure in opposing this Amendment. Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar--of course he was once a paid spokesman, but now an honorary spokesman of the Justice Party--told us that this Amendment was the same as the Resolution of which I have given notice. I say, Sir, that if he will only go through it again, he will see that the difference is indeed very great. Mr. Tanikachalam Chettiyar himself, who moved this Amendment, knows that there is vast difference between my proposition and his Amendment, and, therefore, he never pleaded to be my spokesman in moving his Amendment.

12th December 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

"So far as my proposition is concerned, my only object, Sir, is to spend no more upon this Exhibition. That will come on between the present Resolution and the present Amendment. But here, first of all, we have to see whether the Resolution of Mr. Satyamurti is to be supported by us. Certainly, Sir, I will have to ask your permission to move my proposition in case Mr. Satyamurti's Resolution is not carried, which I hope will not be the case. But so far as this proposition is concerned, Sir, I may say that I honour my dignity and my word as much as the two gentlemen who have spoken in favour of the Amendment. I was one of those who heartily voted in support of the proposition granting money for this Exhibition. Further, I am one of the leading members of the executive committee, or rather I was, for the Coimbatore district for collecting exhibits in that district. May I go further and say that I am one of those who subscribed the first instalment towards the expenses of that committee? But all that, Sir, is ante-diluvian; all that is pre-historic.

"One other point referred to by Mr. Tanikachalam Chettiyar was that we sanctioned this money fully knowing the treatment that we had in the Colonies. Is there no difference, Sir, between the Self-Governing Colonies and the Crown Colony of Kenya? The whole question is that when we passed that Resolution granting the money for this Exhibition, we knew that we were not treated properly by the Self-Governing Colonies, and we thought that by our producing our products in this Exhibition, probably economically and commercially the Self-Governing Colonies might think that India was also capable of doing something for them by supplying them raw-products and then might probably change their minds so far as the treatment of Indians was concerned. But things have changed very much in England which was pretending to safeguard the interests of our Indian subjects and went to war with the Boer Republic for the purpose of saving the honour of the Indians. England which spent so much of money and so much of blood, Indian and European, by saying that she went to war with Germany for the protection of the freedom of the various weak nations, England which has got full control over Kenya in getting equal treatment for Indian and European subjects, she has neglected her duties, she has foresworn her responsibilities and in a weak moment, in a selfish moment, has said that India shall be only a slave even in the far east Kenya. Well, Sir, many important facts have intervened between that day when we sanctioned this money and this day, and therefore, whatever might have been our attitude then, we must now change it.

"Then, Sir, we are told that we have promised and, therefore, we must keep it. Well, Sir, Ravana appeared before Sita in the garb of an ascetic and wanted alms. That innocent Sita, that charitable Sita, then went out to give him alms. The demon appeared then in his true form. Can any one say that Sita should give alms to Ravana even when he appeared in his true colours? Supposing, Sir, we give permission to a man who comes and pretends to be a beggar and wants permission to enter the house for shelter are we to continue the permission, Sir, even after knowing that he has got a bad heart and would stab every inmate of the house and walk away with all the property? England has appeared in her true colours. England has appeared practically in the garb of a robber, nay of even a murderer, so far as Indians' rights in Kenya are concerned and therefore we must treat her in the way in which she deserves to be treated.

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [12th December 1923]

12 noon. “Unfortunately, we have no other way excepting this one of showing to the world our resentment, at the wrong that every Indian feels. There is no use of pretending and saying ‘I also feel’. What is the use of your feeling unless you speak it out? If you feel, you must act. This is the moment of action. The Amendment goes to say that we should not incur further liabilities. What does it mean? Probably, we have already incurred all the necessary liabilities. What remains to be done now is probably only to decide who should go, whether the Director of Industries with his troupe of followers should go or somebody else; probably they have even purchased their tickets for going and returning; probably contracts have been made for erecting a very spacious pandal, and therefore there is practically nothing more to be done. Whatever our liabilities, whatever our obligations, whatever litigation might be brought forward, so far as this Council is concerned, we must face them. The greater our liabilities, the larger the number of suits that will be filed against us, the better will it be to proclaim our indignation to the world. The pandal should remain unfinished and as it is, with one post in one place and without a post in another, with roof not covered in one place, so that the millions of people that go there for the Exhibition may see the unfinished condition of the Indian pandal and put the question ‘Why is this not complete?’ That will show that we too, Indians, have feeling and that this is the way in which we have expressed our feeling in this matter. But if you are going to fulfil all your obligations, nobody will be made to understand our feelings. It is only by repudiating our liabilities, it is only by not spending a pie more on these things that we can show to the world at large that we, Indians, are able to act as we feel.

“With regard to this Amendment, I think we can as well throw out this Resolution instead of passing such an Amendment as this. It has been said that economically we will be very much benefited. Thanks to what has been said by Mr. Thanikachalla Chettiyar, we must guard our honour more than the millions of money that we may lose. But, even as it is, I know a little of business and I know that so far as business is concerned those people who have invested large sums of money in such businesses would rather feel glad if their exhibits are not sent to England. If our raw products like cotton, groundnuts and other things are not exported to England, and converted into manufactured goods and brought here, it is all well and good for us. We want strong export duties as well as import duties to prevent our raw products going to England and coming back as finished goods, so that our starving millions may have something to get by way of wages. So far as India is concerned it is not a question of unemployment as it is in England but it is a question of life and death for our starving people who have to be fed with a few hundred rupees for life or a few annas a day, so that we Indians strongly feel that the English nation is not going to benefit the Indian nation by taking away our raw products. But whatever that may be, it is not a question of rupees, annas, pies. I may echo, as Mr. Satyamurti has said, that we may pledge ourselves to any losses that we may incur on this account. If necessary, indemnity Acts may be passed to guarantee against litigation and various other liabilities. Such indemnity Acts were passed to safeguard the interests of officers concerned in the Punjab wrongs, in Egypt and so on. If necessary, we will be prepared to incur the cost of any litigation. This is not a question of money but this is a question of national

12th December 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

honour. We will be prepared, if necessary, to grant supplementary grants for lakhs and lakhs if suits are filed against us. By this boycott we will show that we are prepared to pay heavily to save our honour. Let the suits come, let the liabilities be forced on us; we will put up our defence. If to-morrow or day after to-morrow damage suits are brought in, we will show to England and to the world that we are rather prepared to pay lakhs and lakhs of rupees than risk our honour. Therefore, Sir, I heartily oppose this Amendment that has been put forward."

Mr. ABBAS ALI KHAN :— " Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Amendment of Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar and to support the motion of Mr. Satyamurti for three reasons. Sir, when this Exhibition was arranged to be held in London, I presumed the necessity was that the Conservative Government wanted to bring about a feeling in favour of protection, or at least imperial preference, to save the nation from unemployment which was ruining the nation in the shape of the doles that had to be paid to these unemployed families, and also, I believe, with a view to put a stop to competition. They wanted to show to the world that our raw products would be marshalled for the benefit of their industries. Now, Sir, the Liberal Government has come into power. Practically speaking, it has come into power, because the results of the elections secured a majority for the Liberals and the Labour Party who are not going to allow the Conservatives their way of protection or imperial preference. So, there is absolutely no necessity that India should participate in this British Empire Exhibition.

" Secondly, our finances are so bad. When we want our schoolmasters, our vettis and talaiyaris to pay more, we are asked to find the money, and the bureaucracy say that they cannot find the money. But for this Exhibition and for all this *tamasha*, they come forward with money and ask us to sanction the expenditure. So, Sir, on the ground of retrenchment I am strongly against this action of spending Rs. 2½ lakhs in a foreign country.

" Thirdly, Sir, England and her Ministers have proclaimed from platform and pulpit that they went into the Great War to demolish the German Imperialism and to proclaim the principles of justice, liberty and humanity to the world, and we, Indians, most cheerfully sacrificed our money, our lives and our blood for the cause of England, because England has stood for all that was noble and for all that was humane in the world. But what spectacle have we now, after the Germans have been defeated in the war, of those wonderful and magnificent principles. They have all been forgotten. We have now this paradox of our own quondam friends, those people in the colonies and in the dominions, with whom we fought side by side whether in the snow-covered peaks of Flanders or in the black-cotton soils of Mesopotamia, treating us as slaves. Sir, it is a slur on us. If it had been possible for our nation, we would have a peaceful blockade, we would have ruptured the diplomatic relations, and we would have given the *causus belli*. But all these things are prohibited to us, and this is the only thing that is open to us to do. If we want to show to the British Government that we are anxious not to suffer this ingratitude at the hands of her colonies, we can only do so by supporting the Motion of Mr. Satyamurti and opposing this Amendment."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, Sir, as one who was responsible in the main, if not wholly, for our taking part in

[Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu] [12th December 1923]

the British Empire Exhibition, as one, Sir, who from the beginning up to the date on which I had to hand over charge had had to do all that was necessary on the part of the Government of this province and on the part of the people of this province, I feel it my duty to rise at a somewhat early stage of this debate and give expression to my own opinion and the views that I hold both on this Amendment and on the Resolution."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think it will be convenient for hon. Members to confine themselves to the Amendment. In fact, we are now dealing with the Amendment. Later on, hon. Members will have opportunities of discussing the main Motion."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"I am conscious, Sir, of it. From my point of view, there is absolutely no difference between the Amendment and the Resolution itself, and my arguments will apply to both the Amendment and the Resolution which I rise to oppose. As regards the other point, viz., that there will be another opportunity of speaking on this Resolution after the Amendment has been disposed of, I am afraid that if the Amendment is carried such an opportunity will not arise for me."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"If the Amendment is carried, the House will have before it the main Motion of Mr. Satyamurti as amended. The discussion will continue on it. I suppose the hon. Member will not speak on that Motion."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"Thank you very much, Sir. But, as I already stated, my position is such that both as regards the Amendment and the Resolution it would perhaps be advisable for me to set forth my arguments once for all."

"Mr. President, at the very outset I may be permitted to state that I do not yield to any one in this House, or for the matter of that to any one in this country, in the feeling of resentment, sorrow and humiliation and all that has been said about the decision of the British Cabinet. But, Sir, my point is this: how does this Resolution and ceasing to take part in the British Empire Exhibition, which will be the result of passing this Resolution or this Amendment, help us? I can understand, Sir, if a proposal is before the House, assuming that it is possible for such a proposal to be before the House, as for instance, that we should levy a heavy import duty on South African coal. I can very well understand, Sir, if there is a proposal for an embargo on or prohibition of the admission of South African diamonds into this country. I can understand, too, if an absolute boycott of both those goods into this land is urged upon. I can also understand if there is a proposal before this House, or in any other place where it may be competent to raise such a proposal, that no South African should be permitted to enter the Services in this country. What I am afraid I cannot see is this: how a resolution against our taking part in this Exhibition would affect the situation or alter the humility, the resentment and all that is involved in the unfortunate decision of the British Government? Sir, I think it is like what Macaulay describes as the action of the Jesuits who secured a Decree or Bull from the Pope against Galileo when he discovered that the earth was moving round its own axis and going round the sun. Sir, in spite of that Papal Bull that it was not so moving, they could not prevent the earth from moving

12th December 1923] [Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu]

round its own axis and going round the sun. And what is more, the Pope and the Jesuits could not prevent themselves being moved along with the earth's motion." (Cheers.)

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I think this sort of reference to the Jesuits and the Pope is quite out of order. First of all, what the hon. Member says is a perversion of truth. I can prove, Sir, that neither the Pope nor the Jesuits ever issued a Bull in which they declared that the earth did not move round its own axis. Controversial matters like this affecting religion should not be uttered."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I should think that it is not a controversial matter. But in any case there is no point of order in it (laughter). It seems to be a reference to an historic matter, and unless there is a good historian here, a better man than myself to answer with authority on the subject, (laughter) there is no use of taking an objection to the statement."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I beg your pardon, Sir. The statement hurts the religious feelings of several hon. Members of this House. There are some Roman Catholic Members in this House, and it is not right to say something against the Jesuits and the Pope which offends the religious sentiment of such hon. Members."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI :—"I think the hon. Member, Sir K. V. Reddi, was merely quoting from Macaulay, though that is not the last word on the subject." (Laughter.)

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"It is not, Sir, my intention to offend the feelings of any one in this House or any one outside this House, whether Jesuits or the followers of the Pope. I have the highest regard for the Catholic Members, and let me not be understood in the least as offending anybody's religious feelings. As Mr. Ratnaswami said, I was referring to a passage in Macaulay in order to draw a parallel to the present Resolution.

12-15 p.m. "Now, Sir, so far as the Amendment is concerned, to me it appears to be worse than the Resolution itself. What the Amendment says is that there should be no further obligations. I may tell you, Sir, for the information of the House that the obligations already incurred come up to about 2 lakhs being the major portion of the estimate. Such being the case, either to take part in it wholesale or not at all, that should be the position. So far as the Resolution is concerned, we have heard two very eloquent speeches. I yield to none in my admiration for the very high eloquence that this House was electrified with yesterday and to-day. But you will permit me, Sir, to ask on what grounds it has been shown that we should not take part in the Exhibition? No doubt a great deal has been said about the manhood of India and Indians and all that. I quite agree; but how is this Resolution going to help us in restoring to us or getting back for us or our countrymen in South Africa the dignity that they have lost by the unfortunate order of the Government at Home? Great authorities have been cited by my learned and hon. Friend the Member for the University yesterday. The *Justice* newspaper, the newspaper of the party to which I have the honour to belong and with which I have all along been working, has also been quoted. I am glad that the authority of *Justice* has been recognized by my hon. Friend. At the end of the quotation, Sir, there is a condition that my Friend has evidently ignored, viz., "if

[Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu] [12th December 1923]

only we could thereby convey to the British public even a faint impression of the great indignation felt by one and all of us." Now, Sir, can we do that by passing this Resolution? Again, reference has been made to the Rt. hon. Mr. Srinivasa Sastri. There again it is a matter for gratification that one of the great moderates and a great Swarajist meet on a high common platform. Again, Dr. Sapru, to whom I am myself going to make a reference presently, has been quoted. But the very fact of his having taken part in the Imperial Conference when he full well knew that on this question of the Empire Exhibition there was a strong feeling to boycott, is proof positive of his approval of this participation in the Exhibition. For, after all, the British Empire Exhibition itself is a child of the Imperial Conference. Sir, the hon. Member for the University of Madras has quoted Dr. Sapru and said that the Resolution passed by the Bombay Corporation to boycott had considerably strengthened his hands. But what is it that the Bombay Corporation resolved to boycott? It is not the British Empire Exhibition, but the British goods as the telegram quoted clearly shows.

"Sir, I was saying that my hon. Friend has quoted Dr. Sapru and the Government of India. He has been good enough to recognize the great stand which the Government of India have taken in this matter and the hon. Member was also pleased to appreciate the bold stand which Dr. Sapru has taken in the Conference itself. Another gentleman who is recognized as a great friend of India, one whose cult has always been listened to with great respect in this land—Mr. Andrews—says that over the dark clouds of the Kenya decision there hangs a silver lining and it is even possible that the cloud itself may disappear altogether. What will be the effect under those circumstances if we carry this Resolution? Will it not be disastrous, detrimental to our own interests? Are we not to strengthen the hands of the Government of India? Sir, I respectfully beg to submit that if we pass this Resolution it is bound to react on us. Our Resolution is admitted to be an act of retaliation, and retaliation naturally provokes counter-retaliation, and in such a case, Sir, the relative strength of the parties cannot be ignored. The authority of Dr. Besant has been cited. I take it also that it is that authority that stated that brickbats could be returned by bullets; Indian brickbats may not hurt but British bullets may easily. . . ."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"May I say, Sir, that if my hon. Friend wants to quote, he may do so by stating all the facts upon which that statement was made? I may point out that it is altogether unfair to single out a passage from the entire context and then quote it."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"Sir, it is not my intention to be unfair to any one or misquote any statement. I am only quoting from memory."

"Now, Sir, let us for one moment calmly think for ourselves on what grounds we are asked not to take part in the British Empire Exhibition. There must be some reason for not taking part in it. Much has been said of the conditions in South Africa. In spite of the electric eloquence displayed by the hon. the Mover yesterday and the graphic description he has given us of the condition of Indians in South Africa, I am not able to see any argument on which he urges this boycott. What is it that he has said by

12th December 1923] [Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu]

way of argument to maintain his position? He has spoken of the honour and dignity of India, of the assertion of India's manhood, India's self-respect, of India's outraged dignity. I sympathise with him and I join with him in his resentment and condemnation. But is not all that mere sentiment—an honourable sentiment it may be? But what is required here is not sentiment or assertion but reason and argument. In the speeches that were delivered yesterday and to-day, I searched in vain for the latter. There was much of assertion and nothing of argument and they reminded me, Sir, of Gratton's description of one of Lord Clare's speeches, 'great generosity of assertion, great thrift of argument, a turn to be offensive, without the power to strike, fury in temper, and famine in substance' (Cheers). It is needless to add, Mr. President, that no amount of sentiment can be a substitute for reason and argument.

"The hon. the Mover has asked us that we should look upon this not as a party measure. Well, Sir, I consent to that. I speak for myself and I hope my party will agree with me in this matter. What are the merits of the case actually? A communal franchise has been accorded to us and segregation from the Highlands has also been provided."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"And emigration laws specifically intended to exclude Indians and Indians only have also been passed."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"I thank him, Sir; but I am concerned only with the first two. Now, as regards communal franchise, yesterday when the question of the pay for the village officers was being considered and when the hon. Member, Mr. Legh, pointed out that the question of pay need not be considered along with that of the satisfaction of the services, my hon. Friend, Mr. Satyamurti made an onslaught and said that those who belonged to the service which he said was the Heaven-born Civil Service had been fighting tooth and nail for the assistance and protection of the Government with regard to their pay and emoluments. And he put forward that argument because they fought on grounds of satisfaction. May I with equal reason ask him whether it comes with good grace from him to speak in the manner he did? Are there not representatives of various classes here? Have we not got communal franchise here? How are the thirteen Muhammadan Members elected to this Council? How about the Indian Christians and the Europeans? Are there not a number of registers kept up? And with so many separate classes of representatives, may I ask him if it comes with good grace that we should urge this matter? Not that I do not complain myself about the treatment accorded to our people in South Africa. We have a large number of constituencies and a number of those bodies are sitting in the midst of a conglomerous Council and his reasoning does not go with a good grace. Next, as regards segregation, even in this country a whole population of about a fifth of the nation has been cut off from the rest of us, and they are asked to live in untidy huts far far away from the villages and what about them? When it comes to a question nearer home we do not admit them into our houses but still when it is in far off South Africa, it comes with all the pride of India. Impressions were created in this House, and it has been presumed that everybody would vote for the Motion; but I would ask you to consider what it is that we are asked to do to-day. We are asked not to take part in the venture we have launched upon more than a year ago; we are asked to recede from the

[Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu] [12th December 1923]

position we have been taking for a year and a half; we are asked to recede from the Resolution passed at the Moore Pavilion at a largely attended representative meeting; we are asked to recede from the budget that was passed granting a lakh of rupees towards expenses in this connexion."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"May I know how far the gentlemen that attended the Moore Market meeting can be taken to be representatives of this Presidency?"

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"Mr. President, Sir, it is my earnest desire that discussion in this Council need not result in or degenerate into a desultory skirmish. The hon. Member has got the right to answer me. He can have his say in his own turn, and I really do not see any necessity for this cross-examination.

"Well, Sir, points have been raised to show that there is no economic advantage to be gained by our taking part in the British Empire Exhibition. A speech of mine has been quoted, a speech in which I have pointed out that we have got a few industrial products that we can send; that there is a wealth of natural products in our country, and that it can bring in more money to us. The hon. Member for the University has told us, with a sneer, that cotton and hides are the products which the Development Minister, who is no more a Minister, will be willing to send to that country. May I point out what really the advantage is by sending these articles and what enormous lucrative trade can be developed by sending these products alone so that the House may understand the position? Sir, in 1918-19, the actual exports of hides and skins from this country were worth £18,475,519. That comes to nearly 27 crores of rupees. In 1919-20, this country has exported 2,398,000 bales, the cost of which was £59 millions. If we can get an extra Rs. 10 per bale by their advertisement our gain will be Rs. 2,39,00,000, annually. It was urged that the question should not be judged from the standpoint of rupees, annas and pies. Sir, I look upon this as a business transaction, and points of honour and dignity need not count, when nothing substantial can result therefrom. As Wordsworth somewhere said, 'wisdom is sometimes nearer when we stoop than when we soar' and on occasions like this we may have to stoop to conquer. (Cheers.)

"Well, Sir, the hon. Member for the University of Madras told us that he had travelled in foreign countries. I think I was with him in England and have seen him."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I have noted it."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"Sir, the hon. the Mover of the Resolution said that the Britisher appreciates action and not words. I agree. But what does this Resolution mean? It means words, certainly not action. It is the negation of action—it is inaction. It is words, words, words. If on the other hand, you go and show your articles there, show your raw products there and point out to the rest of the world what potentialities the natural resources of the country have, then, Sir, the world will know that you are a great nation; then they will learn to respect you but not when you tightly sit in a corner. Mr. President, I am told that when I spoke about these raw materials I said that the raw materials should be carried to foreign countries and therefore the implication was that that was all the industrial development and advance in this country that I stood for. I quite disagree. If within the last three years I was able to do anything, hon.

12th December 1923] [Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu]

Members will see that it was only to convert our raw produce into finished articles. I do not want to boast of my actions. But if I had to do anything at all it was in that line alone. The State Aid to Industries Act may be a dead letter as some Member said in this House. It is a humble step taken in the right direction and that is the honest opinion I have held. If the market price of cotton is reduced by ten rupees a bale, the next year, so far as the cotton cultivation is concerned, thousands of acres would be given up. If, on the other hand the price increased by five rupees, cultivation would be increased by thousands of acres. So long as we are not able to use that cotton, is it to be allowed to rot in this country? I base my argument on one ground and on that one ground alone. Our participation in the exhibition means the improvement of our national wealth. With great respect to those who hold the opposite view, while I do not yield to any one in their desire for national liberty, still I would lay great emphasis on the economic aspect which deserves to be solved more than the political problem. It is the chronic poverty and the chronic indebtedness which we have to fight against. Unless we free ourselves from this economic bondage, political freedom will still be farther away from us. By non-participation in the British Empire Exhibition we will get nothing, while participation is one the means by which our economic condition might be bettered". (Applause.)

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"In rising to oppose this Amendment of Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, I should like to have a ruling from you, Sir, as to whether it is open to hon. Members who have yet to address the House to refer to the original Resolution. If the ruling of the President is that we are to talk on the Amendment alone then, Sir K. V. Reddi was allowed to talk on both the Amendment as well as the original Resolution."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Strictly speaking, Members should confine themselves to the Amendment. But if the hon. Member wants to talk on the main Motion he will not be allowed to talk again. Sir Venkatarreddi was given 20 minutes, because he had said at the commencement that he would talk on both. But certainly, he will not catch my eye, if he again stands up."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"I hope Mr. President, the same indulgence would be given to all hon. Members as regards the time-limit. Mr. President, Sir, the Amendment that was proposed by the hon. Member, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, entirely conflicts with the principle or motive underlying the proposal of the hon. Member, Mr. Satyamurti. Mr. Satyamurti did not bring his Resolution before the House on any ground of economy or for the purpose of saving any money to the Madras Exchequer. He wanted to move the Resolution irrespective of any expenditure or cost. I believe he did not in the least calculate what the exhibition would cost or what the financial results would be or what our participation would cost to the Madras Exchequer. I understand from the speeches from the Opposition benches and the benches supporting the Government that the motive underlying this Resolution was that we should show our resentment against the decision as regards Kenya by boycotting the British Empire Exhibition and by not taking any further action in regard to that. Certainly if it were a question of rupees, annas and pies, even supposing we had to spend a little more than what was sanctioned in the last budget, if that could be the only consideration that prevailed, I would be the last man to support the Resolution. But I do believe that the Resolution has been tabled with higher sentiments, that it has been tabled for the purpose of showing that India has got

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [12th December 1923]

a feeling, that India can exhibit that feeling, that India can resent the action and resent effectively too, and to the knowledge of the whole world. I wish that India resents the action and that, to the knowledge of the entire world; the most effective way of doing it is by boycotting the British Empire Exhibition. We have been told that things have been sent, that a certain place in the Wembley Park has been reserved at the Exhibition. The most effective way of showing that we do not at all sympathize, because of the Kenya treatment, is by leaving this place vacant and not exhibiting our goods for the gaze of the other dominions constituting the Empire. Those people who go to attend the Exhibition will put the question: 'why is this place left vacant'? They will learn that India claimed to participate in the Exhibition, that she was an inseparable unit in the Empire, that owing to the unfavourable decision of Kenya she at once thought it more prudent to keep away from the Exhibition and show to the world at large that she will not be in that constituency. Will not the various people who constitute the British Empire then think that the Empire has acted wrongly, that Kenya has acted wrongly, and that the British Government was not wise in giving sanction to the Kenya decision? Then will be the day when the other nations of the world will realize that India will resent any wrong done to her. Certainly we do not agree with the statement that inaction is not action. I submit that non-participation in this Exhibition is positive action and not inactive action. If we do not participate, we are actively telling the world that we are not the people who will take insults lying down, that we are people who will resent and resent most effectively in a manner which the world at large may know. This is an action of the most effective sort, and therefore I support the Motion and oppose the Amendment that has now been brought forward.

"Then, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar told us that the Madras Government has incurred financial liabilities. I certainly would be the last person to shirk the responsibility. Let all the moneys for all the contracts and all the liabilities be paid. Certainly nobody will say that they ought not to be paid. Let us pay the liabilities, but let us not take the advantage or disadvantage, whatever it may be, of participating in the Exhibition. Some may think that it is an advantage; some others are disposed to think that it is not. There is a difference of opinion whether it is an advantage or disadvantage. For this particular advantage of showing to the world that we are a self-respecting nation, I request hon. Members of this House to support the Resolution and oppose the Amendment. All hon. Members of this House who spoke prior to the last speaker were all agreed in thinking that the Kenya decision was wrong and that we must resent it; but some thought that, owing to certain steps already taken, the proposition that is now put before the House was not the proper one and that it ought to be amended. But Sir Venkatarreddi said that Kenya decision was certainly a proper decision. He seemed at the same time to share the view that the Kenya decision was not a proper decision. But when we go into the details of his speech, he said that while we are having here communal electorates, he could see nothing wrong in having communal electorates in Kenya. Is that the reason for which the Kenya decision is resented by the people of this country? It was on other grounds that both sides of the House considered that Kenya decision was an injustice which should be resented. I am sure that Sir Venkatarreddi does not intend all that is conveyed by saying that the Kenya decision is not, after all, a bad

12th December 1923] [Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu]

Members will see that it was only to convert our raw produce into finished articles. I do not want to boast of my actions. But if I had to do anything at all it was in that line alone. The State Aid to Industries Act may be a dead letter as some Member said in this House. It is a humble step taken in the right direction and that is the honest opinion I have held. If the market price of cotton is reduced by ten rupees a bale, the next year, so far as the cotton cultivation is concerned, thousands of acres would be given up. If, on the other hand the price increased by five rupees, cultivation would be increased by thousands of acres. So long as we are not able to use that cotton, is it to be allowed to rot in this country? I base my argument on one ground and on that one ground alone. Our participation in the exhibition means the improvement of our national wealth. With great respect to those who hold the opposite view, while I do not yield to any one in their desire for national liberty, still I would lay great emphasis on the economic aspect which deserves to be solved more than the political problem. It is the chronic poverty and the chronic indebtedness which we have to fight against. Unless we free ourselves from this economic bondage, political freedom will still be farther away from us. By non-participation in the British Empire Exhibition we will get nothing, while participation is one the means by which our economic condition might be bettered". (Applause.)

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"In rising to oppose this Amendment of Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, I should like to have a ruling from you, Sir, as to whether it is open to hon. Members who have yet to address the House to refer to the original Resolution. If the ruling of the President is that we are to talk on the Amendment alone then, Sir K. V. Reddi was allowed to talk on both the Amendment as well as the original Resolution."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Strictly speaking, Members should confine themselves to the Amendment. But if the hon. Member wants to talk on the main Motion he will not be allowed to talk again. Sir Venkatarreddi was given 20 minutes, because he had said at the commencement that he would talk on both. But certainly, he will not catch my eye, if he again stands up."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"I hope Mr. President, the same indulgence would be given to all hon. Members as regards the time-limit. Mr. President, Sir, the Amendment that was proposed by the hon. Member, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, entirely conflicts with the principle or motive underlying the proposal of the hon. Member, Mr. Satyamurti. Mr. Satyamurti did not bring his Resolution before the House on any ground of economy or for the purpose of saving any money to the Madras Exchequer. He wanted to move the Resolution irrespective of any expenditure or cost. I believe he did not in the least calculate what the exhibition would cost or what the financial results would be or what our participation would cost to the Madras Exchequer. I understand from the speeches from the Opposition benches and the benches supporting the Government that the motive underlying this Resolution was that we should show our resentment against the decision as regards Kenya by boycotting the British Empire Exhibition and by not taking any further action in regard to that. Certainly if it were a question of rupees, annas and pies, even supposing we had to spend a little more than what was sanctioned in the last budget, if that could be the only consideration that prevailed, I would be the last man to support the Resolution. But I do believe that the Resolution has been tabled with higher sentiments, that it has been tabled for the purpose of showing that India has got

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [12th December 1923]

shall not be doing justice to ourselves if an Amendment so ambiguously worded as this is allowed to pass. What exactly is meant by saying 'no further liability shall be incurred' I am not able to understand. What he said was, 'we have contracted for so much space, many firms have been given contract for so much freight and these liabilities have to be met.' Now, the proposition moved by the hon. Member for the University does not, either directly or by implication, prevent the Madras Government from fulfilling the contracts which it has so far made. If you have to pay rent for so much space, nobody asks you not to pay rent. By all means pay the charges that the shipping companies demand. It is not a question of how much you shall spend in connexion with this Exhibition, but it is a question whether as a self-respecting nation you are going to participate in it or not. If my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar's Motion is no more than this, namely, that we shall pay off all our existing liabilities but shall not participate any further, I am perfectly sure my hon. Friends in this House will support the proposition. On the other hand, his proposition is neither fish nor flesh but a very bad red-herring. He says that no further liabilities shall be incurred. Now what is the definition of 'further liabilities'? It will be held technically by the hon. the Minister that liability as it stands at present should be met because the Resolution of this House is to participate in the Exhibition to the extent of the money that has already been voted for the purpose. If this is the meaning, if the Amendment is susceptible of this meaning, let us be more straightforward and say, 'we are for it but we are opposed to supplementary grants.' That is a straightforward question which I can understand; but this kind of trying to torpedo a plain issue by a submarine attack, by covering it with ambiguity, is, I consider, not consistent with the high level of dignity of this House. But if the intention of the Amendment is that we shall not be liable for breach of contract before the law, then we are willing to move an Amendment to this effect namely, that at the end of Mr. Satyamurthi's proposition, the words 'after paying off all existing liabilities' be added. That ought to satisfy the financial conscience of hon. Members of this House. But as it is, the Amendment might mean participation in the Exhibition to the fullest extent of the money already got. If this is so, the right thing is to oppose the Amendment.

"The hon. Member Sir Venkatarreddi Nayudu has told us that in his judgment—I consider his judgment as erroneous in this respect—participation in the British Empire Exhibition is advantageous for the country not merely economically but politically also. His capacity for inferences is beyond my understanding. He says, 'Dr. Tej Bahadur Saprú took part in the Imperial Conference; the British Empire Exhibition is some kind of branch of that Conference; since we have taken part in the one, we ought to take part in the other as well'; but he does not say that while a Resolution boycotting British goods could be made, such a Resolution should be made here. He tells us of an action converted into effect. He readily infers, therefore, that wherever you think that action is ineffective you ought to take no action and you ought to wait till Providence comes and brings success to you. Is that the stuff of which true nationalities are ever made? It is not a question whether your action will be effective or not. My hon. Friend has placed the emphasis in the wrong direction. We are a feeble race; we are not powerful; we have not got arms; we could be knocked down in a moment; but that is not a justification why when you are kicked you ought to keep

12th December 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

on smiling or why you could not, in sheer assertion of the manhood still left in you, hit back with all your strength though it is the strength of a dwarf against that of a giant. It is not the question of means to an end ; but it is the question of a principle.

“ Again, my hon. Friend says that we are now exporting so many raw products, so many crores worth of cotton and we will get a good return. But were they not exported before this Exhibition was thought of? And does my hon. Friend think that by sending our raw products now and by exhibiting our skins in that place where they have been exhibited more than once before, we are going to get an increased number of orders from England? We are supplying hides—and I know my hon. Friend is a discriminating or other kind of Protectionist—and our object should be to keep our products in our own country and try to get manufacturing industries established here so that in many ways our country might benefit industrially. However, leaving aside all these questions, the manufacturer is in greater need of our materials than we are able to supply. Are not English people represented here by various firms who are on the look out for every quality and variety of goods? Are there not consular agencies all over this country who are supplying reports every week, and every month regarding the possibilities of expanding their trade in our country? However, I plead guilty to this: that I was one of those who took part in the Moore Market Conference presided over by His Excellency the Governor in order to inaugurate this movement of participation in the British Empire Exhibition. I am proud that I had taken part in that Conference. I did it as a matter of imperial sentiment. I think the limited training that I had in economics, which cannot for one moment be compared with that of my hon. Friend, Dr. Mathai, there, made me feel that as a business proposition it might not be the glorious thing or the grand thing that it was represented to be or might be easily represented in newspaper articles. But we were filled with the sense of imperial partnership and it was our duty to make the Empire Exhibition as great a success as possible so that the foreign nations visiting it might be properly impressed with the might and possibilities of this great Empire. But after this came the decision which has violated all the promises given by the British Government and crushed every hope that we have been entertaining with the best of motives.

“ My hon. Friend from Trichinopoly thinks ‘ let us not do this thing, but let us do a hundred other things ’. It is this kind of irrelevant circumstances that I would deprecate. When a person is asked to do a certain thing, he must judge it on its merits and say definitely ‘ we are going to do this or we are not going to do this ’. Instead of that the suggestion is thrown out ‘ let us boycott the imports from the Dominions ’. We have no quarrel with the Dominions. So far as Kenya is concerned, it is the decision of the British Cabinet. It has also been stated by my hon. Friend that the telegram from His Excellency the Viceroy to Dr. Sapru produced great effect. I do not know if the inference is suggested ‘ let us request the Viceroy to send more telegrams ’.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—“ What I meant was that, as the Government of India and other Governments were in entire sympathy on this question, and the Viceregal Government had made suitable recommendations to the British Cabinet and Dr. Sapru cherished the hope by means of a change of temper effected in the Dominions but one to have the old verdict

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar] [12th December 1923]

reversed, we shall be smoothing the ways of Dr. Sapru and strengthening his hands by being guided in matters like this not by impulse, sentiment or even enthusiasm but by facts and judgment based on those facts."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Sir, I have not in the slightest degree
1 p.m. misunderstood my hon. Friend who thoroughly misunderstood the hon. Member for the University who said that a telegram from His Excellency the Viceroy was sent to Dr. Sapru conveying a message that the Bombay Corporation had resolved to boycott the British goods. Sir, it was not a blank shot that produced the impression but it was a good cartridge containing combustibles from Bombay that produced the impression. Lastly—and we shall hear more of this argument—my hon. Friend Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu touched upon this question, which, I honestly confess, is a disgrace to India, viz., the way in which we ourselves are treating the depressed classes, and asked us what right we had to complain of the injuries inflicted upon our country-men in other parts of the Empire."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"I did not say 'what right have you?' But I simply said that it came with bad grace from us."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I am not thinking of the propriety or the manner that should prevail. Does he feel that we are precluded from taking up this question? It does not matter for me whether it proceeds with bad grace or good grace."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"It does not arise at all in my case also."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Very well. Since he does not complain of the wrongs inflicted on our country-men elsewhere, I shall only just say a word or two not by way of justification, but only to put our case at the proper angle from which we should view the question. Sir, nobody hates more than myself racial or any other kind of inequality. I have been a humble worshipper at the shrine of humanity and not any other shrine. Will any man with humanitarian sentiments say that because you have been perpetrating indescribable wrongs in your own country you should not complain of the wrongs inflicted upon your people elsewhere? What the true humanitarian would say is this: we have wrongs and we will do our best to eradicate these wrongs, but at the same time we must resist any similar wrongs perpetrated elsewhere. I am perfectly sure that my hon. Friend, Mr. Paddison, who is doing in my opinion a most soulful work in his department, will agree that the presence of wrongs in this country is no justification for condoning their existence in other places. That is the spirit in which the hon. Members of this House should look at this question.

"I have only one word more to say and that is that we cannot keep politics apart from trade as we have been advised to do. What is the price of self-respect if it is sunk? What is the good of trading? It is said, Sir, 'let us keep politics and trade apart, let us be economically fit, let us display our riches; that is the way in which we should prove ourselves to be a great nation; it is riches that go to prove the greatness of a nation more than of self-respect'. Well, Sir, I may say that riches have never brought the spirit to a nation. It is only a means though an indispensable means.

12th December 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

More than the equipment and the enlightenment which riches can supply is the man behind the gun and the spirit. It is in that spirit that I request this House to outvote this Amendment and vote for the Resolution, if necessary with the Amendment I have suggested. I can understand a person like my hon. Friend Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu, saying this, though I for one cannot agree with him in saying that 'this is a good thing for you as an economist; you have got so many wrongs in this country that it does not matter if wrongs are inflicted on your countrymen in other parts of the Empire. . . .'

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"I never said that. I already corrected my hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. I put that forward as an argument to show that it did not come with good grace."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I am sorry that in my hon. Friend's estimation I am more incorrigible than I ever may be. Any way, Sir, what is the inference from my hon. Friend's statement referred to. It is 'let us participate in the Exhibition'.

"I may say, Sir, that if the sums we have already voted are not sufficient let us vote for more and make the Exhibition as successful as we can. But that is not the view of my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, who professes sympathy with this country and says once 'We have been outraged; we are at one with you; our political sentiments are identical with yours; but when it comes to action we shall immediately assume an attitude which to an ordinary man untrained in legal subtleties cannot be very convincing.' Well, Sir, I may say if you are going to participate, participate fully. Otherwise, pay all your liabilities, whatever you have incurred, and let all the ships in which you have contracted for freights sail empty. Let all the bills which the banks present to us be duly honoured. But let those who go to the Exhibition ask why is it that these spaces are vacant? Why is it here you see something very different from the rest of the show? Let the disgrace that has been inflicted upon us in Kenya be exhibited there and there is no better way of exhibiting it than by refusing to participate any further in this Exhibition. As I said, once again I repeat that the Government should not be in a false position with regard to the existing commitments, and if necessary we shall move an Amendment to that effect by putting the words (*after meeting all the existing liabilities*) at the end of the Resolution.

"The real issue of the Kenya decision is not so much the decision itself as the spirit underlying it, the doctrine which that decision discloses. I may say to His Excellency the opinion given to me by an English friend of mine, viz., that if this decision was inevitable it could have been embodied, not in the malicious language in which it has been couched, but in a more sincere and straightforward phraseology. Everywhere they talk so much about racial disabilities and that no racial disabilities based on colour or anything else shall be imposed. But whatever that may be, the general proposition in this decision is put down with much circumspection and when you come to the question of colour the very opposite of the general proposition is put down. Now it is not merely the wounded self-respect that finds its way in this Resolution but it is also the sense of pity for the statesmen who issued a document like that. And we owe a small debt of duty to the British statesmen in showing that we are also vindicating our just resentment by

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [12th December 1923]

boycotting this Exhibition which is the only loyal, sincere and straightforward way. I may assure my hon. Friends opposite that nobody will make this a party question. This is a national question. We have avoided all reference to the past commitment of the parties. Grave national issues are in the balance. It does not matter what would be the effect of your action or indignation. The Amendment is neither fish nor flesh but a bad red herring. An attempt to torpedo a plain issue by a submarine attack is not right. Therefore with all due deference to my hon. Friends on the other side of the House I say that this has become a national question, and so far as our national interests are concerned is it not right that our Legislative Council should not only vote with a united voice, but, with no uncertain voice, oppose the Amendment that has been introduced and pass the Resolution with the additional phrase I have suggested?"

Mr. VENKATARAMA AYYAR alias V. PANTULU AYYAR :—" Mr. President, the glorious partnership in the British Empire which we are invited to participate in reminds me of the story of the Giant and the Dwarf who went to battle together. After many battles fought, when the two began to count the spoils the dwarf had lost his two legs and two arms. Such is the fate of India to-day. After 150 years of partnership with the British Empire, to-day we are dying, mutilated and bleeding, unable to resist the oppression or retaliate it as one hon. Member put it. So I think our partnership should be set on more definite basis with mutual consent. Further we are asked that for sentimental considerations we ought not to forego the economic advantages that may accrue by participating in this Exhibition. I would beg to remind the House that this Exhibition is not to the advantage of India at all, but only to show to the outside world, especially to America and other countries, whose raw products are exported to England, that the latter country is depending for her raw products on a great Dependency where they can be produced in abundance, even if America takes to cornering its raw products. (Hear, hear!). So I beg to emphasise that no advantage, economic or otherwise, would accrue to India. For this reason, and also for the various other Reasons which the hon. the Mover of the Resolution so well pointed out to us, we ought to boycott the Exhibition."

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—" Sir, I rise not only to oppose the Amendment but also the original Resolution. I wish to offer only a few remarks. My hon. Friend Mr. Satyamurti with all his eloquence, with his might, and with all his political tactics, wanted us to vote for his Resolution. One thing which I just want to know is this: have the grievances of the so-called depressed classes, the suppressed, the down-trodden classes been redressed in this country? They are treated like beasts in our own country. Such is the position of the depressed classes in our own country. We now complain that Indians are not treated properly in Kenya. Sir, my hon. Friend, Mr. Satyamurti, has not said a word about the treatment meted out to the depressed classes in this country. Sir, let me quote a verse from the *Bhagavat Gita* which says that—

'Whenever there is danger to the cause of righteousness on earth I (Lord Krishna) come down as Avatar on earth to redress those wrongs'.

"That is now what is happening. The depressed classes in this country are undergoing hardships which are indescribable. We want to reform the

12th December 1923] [Mr. R. Veerian]

conditions in Kenya. The depressed classes here are not only poverty-stricken but enveloped in utter ignorance. For the last 2500 years nobody here ever fought for their social uplift. But we are however fighting for political freedom. What is the use of political freedom, Sir, when we are unable to ameliorate the depressed classes in our own country. We do not at all care for political progress. What is the use of asking for political freedom when we are not able to satisfy the hungry people, the depressed classes who are suffering from starvation for the last 2500 years. The first thing to be done is the amelioration of the depressed classes in this country. That is what is wanted, Sir. Every minute and every hour new social

1-15 p.m. disabilities are imposed upon us, and yet they expect others to do justice to them. If you will permit me, Sir, I will quote a Tamil proverb which they seem to forget. ஊரார் பிள்ளையை ஊட்டி வளர்த்தால் தன் பிள்ளை தானே வளரும்.

“Is it not a fact that the depressed classes have not been done justice and that they have been existing down-trodden for years and centuries? It is for these sins that the Indians have been made to suffer in Kenya and elsewhere. If we had been treated properly here, nothing of the kind complained of now, would have happened. Therefore, God has taken birth to punish the wicked deeds of the caste Hindus here. (Laughter). There is no use of finding fault with the foreigners when Indians are not treated properly in India. If Indians begin to realize and begin to treat their fellow-Indians properly, then, Sir, I predict that everything will be all right. The foreigners give us a better treatment than that given by our fellow-Indians. They raise no sentimental objection with regard to the touching of the depressed classes. If you go to Malabar, you can see how badly they treat us. There, the question of unapproachability is nothing but ridiculous and hopeless misery. (Laughter). We want to do away with these things which go to the very root of our social life. The politicians here never cared for all these things, but they are always longing for political reforms. Agitations after agitations go on for political reforms, but what is the use? Nobody comes forward to remove our disabilities and if at all anybody comes forward to do his mite to elevate the condition of the depressed classes, he is being oppressed and he is asked not to work for our cause and is excommunicated from his community.

“The hon. the Mover, Mr. Satyamurti, said that he was obliged to bring this Resolution from a high sense of honour and responsibility and further stated that the Resolution was a very very mild one presented in a very mild form. But what about the motive contained in that Resolution, Sir? It is nothing but boycotting the Empire. Supposing all the depressed classes were to rise up to-day and boycott the so-called high class (caste) people, would my hon. Friend tolerate it, Sir?”

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“May I say, Sir, that I for my part would welcome it?”

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—“Sir, the hon. Mover would at once telephone to the Commissioner of Police to arrest the depressed classes as a whole. (Laughter).”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“Sir, may I assure my hon. Friend that I will do nothing of the kind?”

[12th December 1923]

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—" I am very glad that he is so sympathetic. I still believe that he will not act as he pretends." (Laughter).

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" On a point of order, Sir, is the hon. Member in order in saying that I am pretending ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" He did not say so, I believe."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I heard him say so, Sir."

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—" It is open to every hon. Member to say what lies at the back of every other hon. Member and I repeat it, Sir. I do not think, Sir, that I am out of order in saying that. I am only saying what strikes me as to what actually lies at the back of another hon. Member. I believe it is open to hon. Members to say that. The hon. Member is pretending to . . . "

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Sir, I ask for your protection. Is the hon. Member in order in saying that I am pretending ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member, Mr. Veerian, is evidently not much acquainted with the Legislative Council. Hon. Members must not attribute motives to one another. That is prohibited. If one hon. Member suspects that another hon. Member has something at his back, of course let him keep it for himself and ventilate it outside the House but not inside. It is understood that hon. Members must treat one another as gentlemen and refrain from attributing motives."

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—" Sir, I feel very sorry for what I said. I have only a few words more to say. As I have already said, for the last 2500 years or more nothing has been done towards the elevation of the so-called depressed classes. I hope that at least in future, they will realize our intolerable condition and promptly elevate our condition and treat us as equal citizens to share all the rights and privileges in the country. Even now, I am sorry to say, several elementary rights have been denied to us and nobody cares to espouse our cause. We are not, even now, admitted into public schools and into the public latrines contributed and built out of public funds."

At this stage (at 1-25 p.m.) the House adjourned for lunch.

The House re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m. with the hon. the Deputy President in the chair.

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" Sir, I rise to oppose the Amendment moved by my hon. Friend Mr Tanikachala Chettiyyar. The essence of the original proposition is the non-participation of India in the British Empire Exhibition. This Amendment simply says that we should incur no further liability in connexion with the British Empire Exhibition. It does not commit itself to any proposition as to whether the Government should participate in the coming Exhibition or not. To put it shortly, it is vague; it is taking the soul out of the original Motion. That by itself is a sufficient ground to make up my mind to reject the Amendment. Now, as regards the question of boycott, it cannot be denied that the Kenya decision of the British Cabinet has caused widespread discontent, and a most acute disappointment among all sections of our countrymen, whether they be Moderates or Extremists, Hindus or Muhammadans. All feel alike in the matter that India's rights have been ignored mercilessly. Indians claim that they must be

12th December 1923]

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

equal citizens in the British Empire. There is a huge volume of feeling that India has been wronged, wronged seriously, and that this wrong ought to be retaliated in a suitable manner. I was very much surprised at the attitude taken by my gallant Friend, Sir K. Venkata Reddi, on this matter. I thought he would stand severely alone, but a few minutes later Mr. Veerian joined him, and he secured some support for his position. Now it was a surprise to me to see my gallant Friend justifying what has been done in Kenya. He professed to express his full sympathy with the object of this Resolution, but the whole effect of it was taken away when he went on justifying the measures that have been adopted in Kenya. I do not think there would have been any necessity at all for the steps now proposed if the government of the country had vindicated our rights in a suitable manner. The Government of India whom we look up to for the protection of our interests is reduced to a position of impotency and is considered to be a subordinate Government. The Government of India did not think of even protesting against the Kenya decision. We are now absolutely powerless. The question that arises for our consideration is what we shall do to retaliate. We were told at the time of the Imperial Conference by the Colonial Premiers that if they hit us why not we hit them in return. So, the question now is how to hit them in return. There cannot be any two opinions in this matter that India's wrongs must be righted. We must express our indignation in a suitable manner. My hon. Friend, Sir K. V. Reddi, asked what we were going to achieve by passing this Resolution—the earth will go on moving on its own axis. Now, whether the earth goes on moving on its axis or not, we have to demonstrate our feelings in a suitable manner. I cannot think of any other method of doing so than by passing this Resolution.

“All kinds of commercial considerations were sought to be imported in a matter which affects our self-respect, our own national existence and national dignity. Such commercial considerations ought not to be allowed to come into play in this matter. Our position in regard to this matter was summed up splendidly by Sir T. B. Saprú at the time of the Imperial Conference. He said:

‘Sir, let me tell you frankly, as a subject of King George, I fight for a place in his household, and will not be content with a place in his stable.’

“That sums up the situation. No doubt all the allotments were made when we were hoping for a favourable decision at the hands of the British Government. All those hopes have now been dashed to the ground. Even at the Imperial Conference our gallant representative, Sir T. B. Saprú, was not able to achieve much. It is not his fault. He proposed a committee which was accepted by the Colonial Secretary. We must demonstrate to the whole world the strength and volume of feeling that we have got in the matter. In this matter I feel strongly, and we have to reject this Amendment. It is a futile one; it does not go far enough. I quite agree with Sir K. V. Reddi when he said that we must either participate or stop completely. That would be a consistent attitude to take up in the matter. I have heard it said of a noble son of Rome, that when the liberty of Rome was in danger he would rather be a dog and bay the moon than be such a Roman. I would rather be a dog and bay the moon than be such an Indian. With these few words I support the Resolution.”

[12th December 1923]

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Mr. President, it seems to me, Sir, that this Resolution is bound up indissolubly with India's honour and self-respect. It also seems to me that it is the duty of the House not merely to recognize, but also to maintain at any cost India's honour and self-respect. If I rise to speak by way of opposing this Amendment, it is with a view to appraise this hon. House of the intensity of feeling that prevails in the district from which I come. I know it for a fact, and I am not disclosing any State secret when I say, that a few respectable merchants in my district who were inclined to participate in the Exhibition by sending some of their exhibits have, since the Kenya settlement, resolved to have nothing to do with it consistent with their sense of honour and self-respect as Indians. Whatever might have been the state of affairs at the time when this House gave its assent to the former Resolution that was moved by the Minister for Development nearly two years ago, since then much change has come over the country. There has been a great change in the attitude of Britain to us. And to-day the question naturally arises that when our position as partners of this growing Empire has been affected, whether, consistent with our national self-respect, it is permissible for us to participate in the Empire Exhibition as irredeemable helots of the Empire. That is the question which we have to consider. Occasions such as these seldom arise and when they do arise it is incumbent upon us as representatives of the people to face the situation fully, squarely, and even honourably. Viewed in that light, I would venture to submit for the consideration of the House that the only effective and potent way in which we could express in unmistakable terms our feeling of resentment is by boycotting the Empire Exhibition absolutely. By this method we shall be able to exhibit to the outside world what the feeling of this country is and to what extent India is outraged, and what steps she is prepared to take with a view to assert and maintain her self-respect. So far as the Kenya settlement is concerned, I would venture to submit that it has placed on us a badge of inferiority and has also reduced us to the position of helots of the Empire. Can we in that state of things, and wearing that badge of inferiority on our breasts, send our goods and participate in the glorification of that Exhibition? If I understood my hon. Friend, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar aright, he told us that certain commitments had been made, certain obligations had been incurred and that certain legal obligations were likely to ensue and that the Madras Government were likely to be sued for damages. We will not be alarmed at those state of things. Let us meet those claims for damages and pay them heavy compensation if necessary when they seriously think of claiming such compensation. But let us make our protest effective by keeping the stalls absolutely empty. Then the question will naturally arise as to what had happened to keep those stalls empty. That will serve as an eye-opener to the world and to the people who are sending their goods there. That will make them realize that India had been wronged and humiliated and that something must be done in order to right the wrong.

“ I am not for participating in this Exhibition with a view to reduce our liability for damages or on account of the three or four considerations which my hon. Friend, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, had in view and to which he adverted in his speech. He stated that on account of those considerations we were obliged to participate. I am rather led to think that these considerations, far from supporting him, ought to take

2-45 p.m.

12th December 1923] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

him just in the opposite direction by making him more firm, more stiff-necked not only in the direction of not incurring further liabilities but in the direction of boycotting the Exhibition altogether. That is the only weapon we can use in default of anything more substantial. The only effective way of expressing our resentment would be to keep the stalls absolutely empty to pay up all the bills, to meet all claims, to withhold all goods, to advise the Government to retain and withhold the goods already sent, and thereby making the boycott a success. I am not therefore well impressed with the via media course or suggestion thrown out for our consideration by the hon. Mover of the Amendment. It may perhaps be pecuniarily advantageous to India. Probably he may have the argument of expediency in view. But in vital questions this argument of expediency cannot find a place. We must face the situation as men, but not as cowards. Therefore, the only honourable course left open to us under the circumstances is to boycott the Exhibition altogether and to vote against the Amendment and in favour of the Resolution moved by my hon. Friend, the Member for the University."

Mr. J. D. SAMUEL:—"Mr. Deputy President, I rise to support the Amendment which has been moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. Indeed we have heard on this occasion the best eloquence to give expression to our sense of indignation, and I do not think I have heard or read anything better than the speech of the hon. Member for the University as expressing the feelings in the matter of treatment of Indians in Kenya. It is certainly most appealing. Sir, I yield to none in the great respect and regard that we should have for our country.

"We are met here to advise the Government, and I would put it to you, do you think you would be giving proper advice by passing the original Resolution? We have been told something about retaliation, but I believe the best of us, the most hopeful of us, do not think that this boycotting of the Empire Exhibition will be any kind of retaliation. Certainly nothing can do greater harm to the honour of our country. This kind of boycott can never be retaliation. Retaliation must be stronger. My hon. Friend Dr. Rama Rao who seconded the original Resolution said that if we boycott the Exhibition, it would cost the British authorities very much. Certainly this boycott would not cost them anything but it would cost us much, and that is why I say it would not be retaliation, because it won't bring happiness either to them or to us. Now let us see whether this boycott will be useful. Nothing can be of use in this world unless there is sacrifice in it. If we sit together here and simply say 'We boycott the Exhibition', what will it amount to? The Resolution is put and all Members vote on it and it may be carried by a majority of five, ten or twenty. But what will be the effect of it? Would it mean that there would be at least an empty room? Are we certain of that? I am afraid I am not at all certain. I am of course new to the Council and am but a student of the rules of procedure and other regulations. But I find from what I have seen that under section 19-A of the Government of India Act the Secretary of State in Council has to safeguard imperial interest, and, in safeguarding imperial interests, he will certainly safeguard the Exhibition. And as such, whatever we may say here, the Exhibition will go on because we have already spent some money and incurred some liabilities. Moreover I doubt very much whether every Englishman or Colonial who goes to the Exhibition would care to know the reason for the empty room. I think their ignorance of other countries is

[Mr. J. D. Samuel]

[12th December 1923]

very great. And then, can we expect them to go on enquiring, whenever they find an empty stall, as to why that particular stall was denuded of wares? Can we expect them to ask 'why is this empty? What is the matter?' Even if some may ask why stalls are empty, they cannot be expected to go further and ask who the stall-holders are and what they are feeling in the matter of treatment by other races. Who would ask whether a Resolution was passed in the Madras Legislative Council expressing the people's indignation and whether, as a result of that, the stalls are empty?

"Then again, there is another thing also which I should like to put before you. Any Resolution passed by us, as also the present Resolution, must clearly state what exactly we feel on the matter expressed therein. But let us not try to affect what we do not really feel. We must be sincere and to the extent to which we are sincere our Resolutions will have effect. The proper thing for us would be to state what we really feel. At the time when the Exhibition was asked to be held, I think thousands of rupees were granted by this House and some thousands were actually spent. Then, subsequently something has occurred which has damped our enthusiasm. So, our Resolution must show clearly where we are and what we feel, and then only can it be said to be a correct representation of our views. If it does not, then it only means that we are going to affect what we are not. That is not the right thing to do. Now, boycotting the Exhibition means that we should have nothing to do with it and we set our face against it from the beginning. But here we have made preparations for it. We are all of us Indians, and yet we had made preparations. Everything has been arranged pursuant to a Resolution passed in September 1922. But subsequently something has happened, something untoward has taken place which we resent, and we want now to stop further proceedings in connexion with the Exhibition. Is that not our position? And do you not think that the Amendment proposed by my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar exactly represents what I have pointed out just now, and what we do really feel. Here is an Exhibition which we wanted to participate in, and we voted money for it and incurred some obligations, but subsequently something has happened. The British Government has done something which denies us equality with others elsewhere, and therefore now we say 'We shall have no more of the Exhibition'. Therefore, Sir, would we not be really telling the people concerned what we exactly feel by voting for the Amendment rather than for the Resolution?

"There is another thing, Sir, which is more important. Now, what is it that the decision of the British Cabinet tells us? It says that we are unfit, morally inferior, morally below them and all that sort of thing. But in regard to this Exhibition we promised co-operation and have already undertaken liabilities. If we pass the original Resolution, would we not be like sulky silly children saying that we will destroy the toy that we were given. Do you think that our respect among the nations would be enhanced in any way thereby? Do you not think that we will be looked upon as silly children or as people who are unfit for self-government? Have we not to pass through the experimental stage for ten years to show that we are fit for self-government and fit to enjoy all the rights of Dominions? And the original Resolution if passed will simply show that we are sulky silly children. At the same time, the injury that would be done to the character of our country would be so great that we cannot think of now. But really we

12th December 1923]

[Mr. J. D. Samuel]

want something to be done to show this: 'We were with you. You said in 1921 that we were all one. We believed and thought also that we were all one and began to co-operate in the Exhibition. But in 1923 you say we are not one, and we also say we do not want to continue as one. We fold our hands and do not want to go any further with regard to this Exhibition.' Therefore does not the Amendment really show what exactly we feel and mean? What is the meaning of affectation and saying in this Council that we are what really we are not.

"There are many other things that may be said, but I think what I have already stated is sufficient. To say that we shall boycott is not going to be effective at all, and it is not retaliation. Unless we vote for the Amendment, I think we will not be expressing what we really feel. I want to add that on this question we should not act as if it is a party question. This is a question for Indians. I beg of hon. Members to try to see what I mean. The hon. Member for the University when speaking for the original Resolution put it on very strong grounds. He has a heart which really feels for our country, and he expressed very strongly and vehemently what he really feels and we will also feel it to the end of our days. Here is our poor dear country and we have got every respect for our country. Every one has respect for his mother country, and would be indignant when his mother country is disgraced. Let us not say with regard to our mother country that it does not care for us or that we do not care for her. Let us all try to see that both are honoured and let us give a united voice. Even though we cannot expect all to vote for the original Resolution, in the matter of this Amendment at least there is a chance of showing exactly what we really feel and we can all vote for the Amendment. Otherwise, it may be said: 'You have given us word that you would participate in the Exhibition and voted funds, but now you cheat us by going back on your word.' And we cannot say anything if that attitude is taken up by the authorities, and how can you thereafter go before the people and say that you are self-respecting, honest, etc. We are not nonentities and we must show that we are consistent. I appeal to my Muhammadan Friends who, I hope, will agree with me in thinking that there is no use of passing the original Resolution and that we must vote for the Amendment. I would also appeal to the European Members sitting on this side to vote for this Amendment. I think that the Europeans are necessary for our country's progress. They have been in our country for a long number of years. They know what we feel about the Kenya decision. They know that our hearts are with them and that we have shed our blood in defence of them, and I would appeal to them to vote for this Amendment and show that the decision of the Cabinet is certainly unjust. Therefore, finally I would appeal to the House on behalf of our poor dear country for which we are prepared to die (hear, hear) and give our life blood, to vote for the Amendment. It is no idle boast, it is no meaningless boast, but it is the real truth. I think we have no business to be here unless we love our country. Under these circumstances, let us show by our voting what exactly we feel in the matter. I, therefore, appeal to my Hindu, Muhammadan, European and all the other Friends of this House to vote for this Amendment."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that an eloquent appeal has just been made by Mr. Samuel in support of this Amendment, I feel

8 p.m.

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [12th December 1923]

constrained to oppose it. I still hope that, if he will only carefully follow the few remarks that I am going to make, he will see his way to change his position and oppose the Amendment. The main ground which he urged in support of the Amendment was that it might be ineffective, that the Secretary of State acting under section 19-A of the Government of India Act would guard imperial interests, that is, the Empire Exhibition, and that all attempts that are being made would be quite ineffectual and useless. May I point out to him, Sir, that this is a matter in which the Transferred departments have control and discretion and the question of the Exhibition was one which was moved and carried at the instance of the hon. Minister for Development? If this House to-day should give its approval to this proposition and state that we shall not hereafter participate in the Exhibition, then clearly it will be the duty of the hon. the Minister for Development and of the Government to give effect to that decision and make our decision effective."

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—" May I point out, Sir, that the hon. Member was not correct in saying that the subject was one belonging to the Transferred departments in the hands of the Development Minister? Although it was I that asked for a grant for the Exhibition, it is not strictly speaking a Transferred subject. There are other subjects, Sir, for instance, the Forest Department, which has got a big share in this Exhibition. In fact, every department of Government has got a share in it, and it was only as a matter of convenience that the Minister who was in charge of Industries was asked to take charge of this Exhibition."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, notwithstanding the explanation given by my hon. Friend Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu, I wish to remind him of the circumstances under which the question of the Exhibition was placed before the Council and the reasons which were adduced to induce this House to accept that Motion. It was then pointed out that there was no mandate from the Government of India in respect of this question, but that, following the example set forth in the Legislative Assembly, a Motion was made in this Council last year. May I point out, Sir, that if this House at the instance of the hon. the Minister for Development thought it fit to take part in the Exhibition, it will be within its limits and within its rights if it should on a future occasion give expression to this unequivocal intention regarding the matter. May I also point out, Sir, that so far as the Resolution passed in this House last year was concerned, it was to the effect

'That necessary steps should be taken and funds provided to enable this Presidency to participate on an adequate scale in the British Empire Exhibition to be held in London in 1924, and as a preliminary a provincial exhibition in Madras should be held in 1923 as will be found suitable and convenient, the necessary funds being provided for the purpose.'

"It will be within the recollection of hon. Members of this House that after that Resolution was passed, various attempts were made for the purpose of focussing public opinion in this Presidency and for the purpose of organizing a provincial Exhibition. After opinions were collected and after various other attempts were made, was it not feasible to give up the idea of the provincial Exhibition, although, taking advantage of the vote of this House, some attempts were made to carry out our programme to a further extent?

12th December 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

"Confining my remarks to the present Amendment, I would state that it would not serve any useful purpose in so far as the Resolution itself suggests that there should be no *further* participation in the Exhibition. The use of the word 'farther', I take it, will enable the Government to satisfy all reasonable requirements and to fulfil all obligations heretofore contracted. I do not think it necessary to add to that Resolution any words such as those suggested by my hon. Friend Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. The Resolution itself, by the use of the word 'further', makes it possible for the commitments which have already been made being respected and being carried out to that extent. It only shows that the Government should not hereafter make any future commitments, and that it should not hereafter bind the Council by any promise made by them. Taking this view, Sir, I am pretty certain that the object of the Amendment in giving effect to the commitments already contracted is already covered by the Resolution and that it is, therefore, unnecessary.

"There is another and far graver reason, Sir, why I think that we should not accept this Amendment. What is the object of the Resolution? Is the object of the Resolution to convey to those in whose hands the affairs of the Exhibition lie at present our feelings that the money spent upon the Exhibition has not been properly spent and that a time has come for regulating that expenditure in better, well-defined and well-directed channels? The object of the Resolution is quite clear. It is only to convey to those abroad that we, as an Indian nation, feel that we are insulted and that we are looked down upon as an inferior race, and that, come what may, come whatever consequences, it is our duty to enter our emphatic protest against the treatment which has been meted out to us. If that is the object of the Resolution, I would only request this House to consider whether the acceptance of the Amendment would in any way carry out that object. If this Resolution is calculated to assert our self-respect, our honour and our dignity, I would ask the House to consider if the Resolution as amended will convey that impression and will give true expression to our resentment? If the Amendment is not intended to carry out that object, I would think, Sir, that whatever might be the fate of the Resolution, the Amendment would not serve that purpose and has, therefore, to be opposed. I take into account the possibility of the throwing out of the Amendment leading to various other consequences. We can rather anticipate those results and take those consequences than allow an Amendment to come forward which will not give correct expression to the feelings of the Members of this House. Sir, is it not a matter for surprise that even when in far-off countries persons have been correctly appreciating the sense of humiliation and indignity to which we have been subjected, we in this House should have some hesitation and falter in this matter? May I, Sir, with your kind permission, read to this House one or two opinions of those in the far-off British Guiana tending to express the present situation? I must on this occasion express my gratitude to the hon. the Deputy President for furnishing me with some information regarding the state of affairs there.

"One Mr. D. S. Payne, who is a Negro himself, writes as follows regarding the feeling in India on this important question. He states in a letter dated 30th September 1923 (which is of a very recent date):

'I for my part am thoroughly in favour of discreet retaliation: if a race sits still and bears all indignity, then the ruling power takes it for granted that there is all contentment on the part of that race; but as I say there must be careful consideration and discretion. When

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [12th December 1923]

a race is weaker, rashness may cause greater troubles, although I may say that the Indians if united would form a powerful factor in this world's affairs. There is wealth and members, but there must be unity."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" May I correct the hon. Member ? It is from Barbados and not from British Guiana."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Thanks, Sir. May I point out in this connexion that if such is the state of feeling which is evoked in a far-off distant country, what should be the state of feeling so far as we are concerned ? Do we, to use the words of Mr. Samuel, show ourselves fit for full Self-Government by submitting ourselves to all indignities and insults hurled against us, or do we, by asserting ourselves as men, by showing forth as persons who would not subject themselves to such kind of degradation, show that we are fit for Self-Government ? I take, Sir, the other view. So long as we are suppliant and on bended knees submit to all indignities and insults offered to us, we will be treated as persons who deserve this and nothing more. I appeal to the Members of this House not to be carried away by the idea put forward, viz., ' let us be more practical ; let us not be playing like children and thus stultify ourselves ; let us go forth and make ourselves worthy in the eyes of other nations '. I would appeal to them rather to go forth and make yourselves heard in the proper perspective and make yourselves understood by those at home rather than in a spirit of deceitfulness, if not of hypocrisy.

" Sir, I would also venture just to refer to another small quotation in this connexion taken from the *Daily Chronicle of British Guiana* under date 19th October 1923 and I shall not detain you long. I shall be satisfied only with this quotation. Dealing with the question of Kenya, this is what they state :—

" . . . the Kenya question is by no means ended, in so far as the British in India are concerned, whatever it may be in so far as it affects the Indians in Kenya.

" Feeling in India is running flood high ; and sneer, and however many will, the end is not in sight. Protest meetings have been held all over India ; and such an avowed moderate as Mr. Sastri has become one of the most violent agitators for boycott of all things, British, including even withdrawal from the Empire Exhibition, Imperial and Economic Conferences. The old irreconcilables are of course just making more capital out of the incident than ever, and laughing at Mr. Sastri and other moderates, for ever placing their trust in the Empire or in its protestations to do Indians justice. Not the least of the contentions put forward by exasperated Indians is that Indians, before the advent of the European, enjoyed free rights of emigration to Kenya for centuries and exercised those rights to the full."

" Sir, I need not detain the House long to satisfy it that this is not a matter upon which we can give up principles, we can give up a correct expression of our feelings. This is not a matter in which we can accept a slight modification of the language of this Resolution in this respect or in that respect. If we really feel that it is our duty to continue to take part in this Empire Exhibition, let us like honest men do so. If we in our innermost portions of our hearts really feel that the worst wrong and injustice has been done to us and that we can only effectively give expression to it by carrying out a boycott of this Exhibition, let us without any faltering give expression to that view and carry this Resolution. I will therefore appeal to this House not to be carried away by this Amendment which has the only effect of taking away the object of this Resolution and giving a different colour altogether to it."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur T. N. SIVAGNANAM PILLAI :—" Mr. President, at this stage I rise to make a few observations on the subject that has been

12th December 1923] [Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu]

round its own axis and going round the sun. And what is more, the Pope and the Jesuits could not prevent themselves being moved along with the earth's motion." (Cheers.)

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I think this sort of reference to the Jesuits and the Pope is quite out of order. First of all, what the hon. Member says is a perversion of truth. I can prove, Sir, that neither the Pope nor the Jesuits ever issued a Bull in which they declared that the earth did not move round its own axis. Controversial matters like this affecting religion should not be uttered."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I should think that it is not a controversial matter. But in any case there is no point of order in it (laughter). It seems to be a reference to an historic matter, and unless there is a good historian here, a better man than myself to answer with authority on the subject, (laughter) there is no use of taking an objection to the statement."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I beg your pardon, Sir. The statement hurts the religious feelings of several hon. Members of this House. There are some Roman Catholic Members in this House, and it is not right to say something against the Jesuits and the Pope which offends the religious sentiment of such hon. Members."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI :—"I think the hon. Member, Sir K. V. Reddi, was merely quoting from Macaulay, though that is not the last word on the subject." (Laughter.)

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"It is not, Sir, my intention to offend the feelings of any one in this House or any one outside this House, whether Jesuits or the followers of the Pope. I have the highest regard for the Catholic Members, and let me not be understood in the least as offending anybody's religious feelings. As Mr. Ratnaswami said, I was referring to a passage in Macaulay in order to draw a parallel to the present Resolution.

12-15 p.m. "Now, Sir, so far as the Amendment is concerned, to me it appears to be worse than the Resolution itself. What the Amendment says is that there should be no further obligations. I may tell you, Sir, for the information of the House that the obligations already incurred come up to about 2 lakhs being the major portion of the estimate. Such being the case, either to take part in it wholesale or not at all, that should be the position. So far as the Resolution is concerned, we have heard two very eloquent speeches. I yield to none in my admiration for the very high eloquence that this House was electrified with yesterday and to-day. But you will permit me, Sir, to ask on what grounds it has been shown that we should not take part in the Exhibition? No doubt a great deal has been said about the manhood of India and Indians and all that. I quite agree; but how is this Resolution going to help us in restoring to us or getting back for us or our countrymen in South Africa the dignity that they have lost by the unfortunate order of the Government at Home? Great authorities have been cited by my learned and hon. Friend the Member for the University yesterday. The *Justice* newspaper, the newspaper of the party to which I have the honour to belong and with which I have all along been working, has also been quoted. I am glad that the authority of *Justice* has been recognized by my hon. Friend. At the end of the quotation, Sir, there is a condition that my Friend has evidently ignored, viz., "if

[Mr. R. Veerian]

[11th December 1923]

committees. If we appoint committees, it is something like appointing too many cooks. One will say that salt is too much, another will say chillies are too much, and a third one will say that tamarind is not sufficient. I am afraid that the committee will come to that. If you have a committee as the hon. Member wishes, you will have laymen also nominated there. It will be a mere waste of money, because they will receive travelling allowances and nothing will be done practically. The hon. the Law Member has rightly stated that the financial condition also should be taken into consideration. It is true that expert opinion should be considered. Therefore, I should like to say that the Government may be requested to improve the irrigation facilities either by appointing a special officer, or by asking their staff to do the needful in the matter. Therefore, Sir, without wasting much time in the matter, I have suggested my opinion and I hope the hon. the Law Member will give the consideration that it deserves."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I am glad to say, Sir, that I have had the usual sympathy and a little more of it from the hon. the Law Member."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"I had intended to say and I repeat, that it is not the usual sympathy, if by that the hon. Member merely means formal sympathy."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"This is not only usual sympathy; this is not only formal sympathy, but something more than all that. The hon. Member has not said what will be done if we take his kind advice after consulting the local engineering officers. I have taken all the steps suggested by him. I have written to the Chief Engineer, the Superintending Engineer and the Executive Engineer. I requested them to put into action the sympathy of the Chief Engineer and it was only a few days ago that the Executive Engineer came to examine four schemes in Kollegal. The Chief Engineer has been pleased to ask him to go into the question."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"I can direct
1 p.m. the Chief Engineer to go to Udumalpet, if necessary."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I am very glad, Sir, that the Chief Engineer too will come to Udumalpet. He must go not only to Udumalpet, but also to other places such as Kollegal and Gopichettipalaiyam. The object of appointing the committee is—if I had not already made it clear—to facilitate the work to be done under the Irrigation Act wherever the schemes are already feasible, otherwise than financially. This committee of officials and non-officials—some of them belonging also to the Coimbatore district—will be able to take the advice of the leading ryots in the various taluks and make them agree to pay either a lump sum by way of advance to carry out the projects or an additional cess by way of water-tax or both if necessary. That is my object in asking for the appointment of a committee. Now that the hon. the Law Member has said that the Chief Engineer will go to that district, I have no objection to wait for the formation of the committee till the Chief Engineer visits the district. I am glad that the hon. the Law Member has said that there are some projects still under consideration. I thought from the Blue Book prepared by the Chief Engineer on the irrigation projects in the Presidency till now that some of them had been abandoned; but now I learn they are still under consideration. Therefore, if the hon. the Law Member is prepared

12th December 1923] [Mr. Sami Venkatachala Chettiayar]

before the Fiscal Commission has said in unmistakable terms that we ought, as far as possible, discourage the exportation of raw products. It may be said that while on the one hand you cannot improve your manufacturing industries, there is no use in stopping the raw products that are sent to other countries. The hon. Member also drew a picture of the probable gain by exhibiting our raw products in the British Empire Exhibition. He has told us that for every rupee of gain on one bale of cotton before, we will get an increase of Rs. 10 and that the large number of bales of cotton that we are exporting will increase our national wealth enormously. It is no doubt true that you can increase the profit twice or thrice, but there is a limit for the increase in the gain. Prices, after all, have to be regulated by world prices and world's supply and demand. For instance, taking cotton, you cannot go on increasing the price of cotton, because it has to compete in quality as well with commodities from other countries. There may be other countries producing cotton which may come up to our standard and which may be sold cheaper. You have also to take into consideration the cost of transit and several other factors which govern the development of a trade. So, Sir, merely by exhibiting all the wool, cotton and such other things to say that we shall be improving enormously our wealth by increase of prices reminds me of the story of Alnaschar who by the sale of his crockery wanted to build a mansion.

3-30 p.m. "Sir, it has been said that political considerations need not arise in the participation of this province in the Exhibition and that we should consider the business point of view only. Even supposing that we concern with the business point of view, so far as the raw products are concerned, where is the chance of getting much increase in prices? I dare say the trade in this country, being as it is, it would not be possible that the increase in prices would reach that level that it would profit the tiller of the soil. We know how crippled are our resources and we know how our banking facilities are handicapped by other considerations. We know also what sort of handicaps our Indian merchants are undergoing in the matter of development of trade. Even supposing that a rise in the price will inevitably follow from the exhibition of our products, how will our Indian merchant improve his position? The hon. the Minister for Development said that in the matter of manufactured articles we have silk and cotton goods. I wonder if it can hold a candle before the manufactured British and Japan goods. This is the first time I ever heard that these silk goods can stand competition with the British manufactures. So even from the business point of view it is unsound.

"Now that the Kenya question has been settled so much to our shame and disgrace, is it worth our self-respect to participate in this Exhibition? It is said that we are losing something like 3 lakhs. We have lost the sum when we passed the participation in the Empire Exhibition and as such where is the question of any further loss? The gate money that the Development Minister has spoken of is, I think, included in the profit and loss account of the British Empire Exhibition. I believe that in answer to the treatment we have had we should be prepared to bear this loss even as a retaliatory measure. What loss is there that we cannot gladly incur in the face of the disgraceful treatment we have had? It has been suggested that the buying of South African coal might be stopped. But that is being done and why not do this also? The hon. the Development Minister said, "we have a strong disease and it requires a strong treatment." But does it not stand to reason that we should use the small medicine that we happen to have near hand until we procure a better treatment?

[Mr. Sami Venkatachala Chettiyar] [12th December 1923]

"Sir, the mandate for this came from the Government of India who in turn had it from the White Hall. There are Indians in the Reserved and Transferred portions of the Government and what have they done to express our resentment? It is their bounden duty to represent the people's collective opinion."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, Mr. President, I am one of those that supported the participation of our Province in the British Empire Exhibition which is to be held shortly. I was on the Exhibition Committee and attended its meetings till most probably its very last sittings."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Regularly."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I am convinced that India's participation in the Exhibition will find a very good advertisement of her products both raw and manufactured and that they may get very ready and profitable market and that the balance of trade may double or treble itself as a consequence."

"Sir, I have another point weighing in my mind. India by assiduously and vigorously partaking in all imperial undertakings, as she did in the great war, may attain a fellowship not only with the freedom loving Britishers but also with the members of free colony, a fellowship of equal status and citizenship in the Empire. And it was with this intention that I gave the interview to a representative of the *Madras Mail* in support of the Exhibition. The Kenya decision came as a bolt from the blue. The self-respect of Indians has been brutally outraged. Sir, as you know Indians are touchy and Indians feel extremely outraged when their honour and self-respect are injured. The Kenya decision has put a stop to all the expectation of the fulfilments of the various promises so solemnly made and it has brutally shattered the confidence which Indians had in the British Cabinet. Sir, India has no place anywhere in the British Empire and where is the rationality of India taking part in the British Empire Exhibition? Sir K. V. Reddi wanted us to act and not to speak; I now ask him to act and have nothing to do with the Exhibition. He also told us that social and political inequalities are existing in our land. While we are trying to level up all social and political inequalities in our land, is it right to recognise the inauguration of it in another land? Sir, does he not belong to the Justice Party and is it not struggling to level up the social and political inequalities in the land and are we not trying to elevate the position of the depressed classes? Why should he not now try the same to those abroad? The depressed classes Member Mr. Veerian asked why should he try to bring down the position of those afar off while he is himself trying to uplift his community? The progressive non-Brahmans have taken up the cause of the depressed classes. They are safe in their hands."

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—"Sir, my hon. Friend is labouring under some misapprehension. He has been speaking of the Indians abroad; but those Indians have mortgaged the liberties of the depressed classes. There is some misapprehension, Sir."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, the Minister for Development has been telling us that we will be losing all the money that we have so far spent on the Exhibition. All the moneys spent by the Government and all the wealth with which India could enrich herself by her participation in the Exhibition cannot stand against the self-respect of our land which is at

12th December 1923] [Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

stake. So I appeal to the Indian Members of this House and also to the domiciled Europeans and Anglo-Indians and also to the official Members, European Members that have toiled all the best part of their life for our land, to vote for this Motion, and against the Amendment."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" Sir, let me tell this House first of all that the Resolution that has been moved by my Friend, Mr. Satyamurti, has got my entire sympathy. And if, Sir, I have made up my mind to vote for the Amendment, it is for the reason that I shall state presently. I will state the position and I expect him to explain and convince me and this House that there will not be serious results by the House adopting the Motion. The hon. the Minister has told us that a very large amount has been expended. So that we need not be saving anything even if the Exhibition is abandoned. But he has told us that about five thousand and odd square feet of space have been taken up and more than three thousand square feet of space have been allotted ; also some fifty thousand rupees have been expended. In these circumstances, I ask my hon. Friend, Mr. Satyamurti, to state what course he would have us adopt now. If the participation is avoided, those with whom contracts have been entered into will have a right for damages and not only that but also they will be entitled to sue for the specific performance of the terms. They have been assured by a Resolution of this House that they will have our help in exhibiting their wares. Let us take it that we carry the Motion and consequently break our contract. Will they not be entitled to a specific performance of their contracts and enforce us to stand by our promises already made and make provision for them to exhibit their articles? And then what will be the extent of damages that we may have to pay? I can very well understand that Mr. Satyamurti who belongs to the Swarajya party may not care for whatever the loss is. But, Sir, as persons representing the tax-payer, are we not to protect the interests of the tax-payer and not waste his money over paying damages? Is it prudent to do so? I am certainly not for such a policy.

3-45 p.m. " All that I wish to say is that to the extent to which we can fulfil our liabilities we cannot withdraw from any of these things. If not, there will be much room for claiming damages. That, Sir, is the position that we have to grapple with. On that point Mr. Satyamurti should be able to convince the House before asking it to vote for the Motion and not for the Amendment. Then, Sir, with regard to the point of Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu Garu that participation is *the best and effective step* for the industrial advancement of the country, I would only repeat what I have already stated, namely, that it is not. If it is said that it is *one* of the steps, I agree with him. Then, Sir, I am in part for joining the Exhibition in so far as it relates to the things already collected. To that extent and to that extent alone can we participate in the Exhibition. I appeal to the hon. Members of this Council to consider this aspect of the question. I am glad that the hon. Minister for Development has not committed himself one way or the other. I would only say, Sir, that I appeal to him to discharge, as far as possible, all the officers and have nothing to do with the Exhibition. I would also ask him to see that nobody has power to act in the name of this Government. I would also ask him to publish widely that the Madras Pavilion, though available, the Government do not propose to have anything to do in the actual Exhibition. Ultimately, I would ask him, Sir, not to let the remaining place hereafter. If the people are willing to take their exhibits,

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [12th December 1923]

let them do so. But let us not commit ourselves further. I think that the Amendment of my hon. Friend is the right course in these circumstances. Hon. Members of the House have to consider how far they can carry out their object consistent with the dignity of this House, and the policy for which they have committed themselves already. For these reasons I support the amendment."

Mr. C. E. Wood :—" I move that the question be now put."

The hon. the Deputy President then called upon Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar to reply.

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" I am thankful to you, Sir, for giving me an opportunity"

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I rise to a point of order as to whether the Mover of the Amendment has the right of reply."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Has any Member the right to question the ruling on a point of order? May I have an answer to that question?"

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Is the mover of an Amendment allowed to reply?"

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" I have allowed him. Of course it is the discretion of the Chair. After Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar speaks, I will put the Motion for closure to the House."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" I am thankful to you, Sir, for allowing me this opportunity to make a few observations by way of reply. I will take the last point first. It has been proclaimed that the progressive non-Brahmans have been overtaken by a feeling of despondency, and that the bolt from the blue came down upon them, and that it blinded their vision. May I remind the House that the Kenya decision or the decision of the Cabinet was so far back as September and that the progressive non-Brahman so late as December, that is after the elections, went to the very grave extent of proposing to send some dancing girls to exhibit their capacity to sing the songs of the Mahabharatha?"

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" I was against sending dancing girls from Madras. But I was for sending our ladies to England. Therein I am progressive."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" He says what I have said and does not contradict it. Well, there were exhibits of manufacturers who were prepared to exhibit them. Sir, we have to look for the bolt from the blue, not from the decision with reference to the Kenya problem but with reference to the Madras politics and the Madras Ministry-making. With that I leave it, Sir. I leave to the House to judge whether this feeling has come from a sense of wrong done to his personal or political matters or wrong done to our friends in Kenya months ago. Now as regards my Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachala Chetti, after listening to him carefully I am not able to make out on what ground he says that the participation is undesirable, whether it is from an economic point of view or from the political point of view. All these reasons we urged in this Council 15 months ago and they all unanimously agreed to support it."

12th December 1923]

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ That was an answer made in answer to the hon. Minister for Development. We have to take into consideration the economic point of view and not the political point of view.”

RAO BAHADUR O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ Yes, Sir, whatever that may be, we will leave it there. My Friend, Mr. Krishna Rao, made a present to the House of some speeches. I propose to ask permission to quote his own speech made 15 months ago. He said :

‘ Sir, before I sit down I wish to make a remark upon the political advantages which the hon. the Minister for Development referred in the course of his speech. I, Sir, am afraid that I cannot express an opinion upon the possibilities of political advantages by the holding of this exhibition. I think I would like to wait and have further proof of the good effects of the deputations which have recently been sent to the foreign countries at a considerable expense. Our distinguished friend the Right Hon. Mr. Sastri is still in the midst of his labours and I hope by the time he comes back we will be in a position to appreciate the possibilities of political advantages by these deputations. I wish this House to consider only the economic aspect of the question and to see if by the step we take we cannot make the country industrially great. That is the only test by which we should be guided without turning our eyes this side or that. And if we are satisfied that we can organise it in a satisfactory manner and add, even though to a small degree, to the industrial progress of the country, it is our duty to give our support to it.’

“ So this possibility of our being badly treated in the colony was before him. It was like this : A cloud of the size of a hand in the horizon which we might have anticipated beyond, overspread the horizon. All the same he said it was not a consideration that ought to be taken into account. He said that it was the industrial greatness with which we should engage our attention. How is it now that he was prepared to set aside the participation without the consideration of the advantages and changed his vision? Is it also a result of the election, Sir? Then we have been listening to the various speeches from my Friends, Mr. Satyamurti and Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. So far as I can gather legal liabilities have been admitted. Mr. Ramalinga Reddi says, ‘ Yes.’ The exhibits which you had already intended to carry might be stopped and cheques sent to the respective persons in satisfaction of the contracts entered into. Mr. Satyamurti is generous enough to say that 50 lakhs of the tax-payer is nothing compared with the national honour. If national honour is to be preserved at all, we need not pay 50 lakhs in a doubtful manner to boycott the Exhibition. I suggest that the House should take into consideration the business aspect, and as we have given the mandate and as the Government have incurred a liability, it should be allowed to the tax-payer as well as the merchants and manufacturers and other industrialists who have been persuaded and induced by saying that Government is going to be the agent of the industrials to expose the exhibits and advertise them. Now on account of political considerations are we to stop it? The damage that is likely to arise has not been taken in the budget calculation and that will be a figure which will stagger the imagination of my Friend, Mr. Satyamurti. In these circumstances, though I do feel that we have not been properly treated, still we think that we ought only in a partial way express our disapproval and not undo what we have done so far.”

THE HON. THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ I may inform hon. Members that Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar does not seem to have the right to reply on the Amendment. But I have permitted him on account of the long and desultory nature of the discussion. This cannot be taken as a precedent hereafter. I now put the Motion that the question be now put.”

[12th December 1923]

4 p.m.

A poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. R. W. Davies. | 25. Mr. P. N. Marthandam Pillai. |
| 2. „ H. Tireman. | 26. „ B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 3. „ C. R. T. Congreve. | 27. Rao Bahadur A. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |
| 4. „ J. A. Davis. | 28. Mr. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 5. „ A. J. Leech. | 29. „ B. Obalesappa. |
| 6. „ C. Nicholson. | 30. „ C. Ponnuswami Pillai. |
| 7. „ A. E. Rencontre. | 31. „ K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 8. „ C. E. Wood. | 32. „ K. Raghuchandra Bellala. |
| 9. „ S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad. | 33. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 10. „ Ari Gowder. | 34. Rao Bahadur P. Raman. |
| 11. „ S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | 35. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 12. „ P. K. S. A. Arumuga Nadar. | 36. „ P. Sagaram. |
| 13. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. | 37. „ J. D. Samuel. |
| 14. „ N. Devendrudu. | 38. „ K. Sarvarayudu. |
| 15. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 39. „ K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 16. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 40. „ R. Srinivasan. |
| 17. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 41. „ Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. |
| 18. Mr. P. V. Gopalan. | 42. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 19. „ B. Mahabala Hegde. | 43. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 20. Rao Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Nayudu. | 44. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. |
| 21. The Zamindar of Kurupam. | 45. Mr. K. Venkatachala Padayachi. |
| 22. Mr. V. Madhava Raja. | 46. „ W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 23. Hony. Lieut. Madurai. | 47. „ R. Veerian. |
| 24. Mr. T. Mallesappa. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 24. Mr. M. Ratnaswami. |
| 2. „ T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 25. „ S. Satyamurti. |
| 3. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 26. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 27. „ C. Maruthavanam Pillai. |
| 5. „ C. V. S. Narasimba Raju. | 28. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 6. Mr. P. Siva Rao. | 29. Mr. G. Rameswara Rao. |
| 7. „ A. Chidambara Nadar. | 30. „ P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. |
| 8. „ K. Koti Reddi. | 31. „ Venkatarama Ayyar alias V. Pantulu Ayyar. |
| 9. „ J. Kuppuswami. | 32. „ B. Venkataratnam. |
| 10. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | 33. „ Abbas Ali Khan. |
| 11. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. | 34. „ G. Abdulla Ghatala Sahib. |
| 12. Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. | 35. „ Abdul Hye Sahib. |
| 13. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 36. „ V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar. |
| 14. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. | 37. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib. |
| 15. Mr. P. Peddiraju. | 38. Mr. T. M. Moidoo Sahib. |
| 16. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 39. „ Muhammad Moosa Sait Sahib. |
| 17. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 40. „ T. N. Bava Ravuttar Muhammad Sahib. |
| 18. „ M. Seetayya. | 41. „ K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 19. „ M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 42. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. |
| 20. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 43. Mr. Janab Muhammad Yahya Ali Sahib. |
| 21. „ Sami Venkatachala Chettiyar. | |
| 22. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | |
| 23. The Raja of Ramnad. | |

47 hon. Members having voted *for* and 43 *against*, the Motion for closure was declared carried.

A poll was then taken on the Amendment with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 7. Mr. R. W. Davies. |
| 2. „ Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 8. „ E. W. Legh. |
| 3. „ Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 9. „ C. Madhavan Nayar. |
| 4. „ the Raja of Panagal. | 10. Dr. John Mathai. |
| 5. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 11. Mr. P. L. Moore. |
| 6. „ Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai. | 12. „ G. F. Paddison. |
| | 13. „ H. Tireman. |

12th December 1923]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 14. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve. | 38. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 15. „ J. A. Davis. | 39. „ K. V. Ramachari. |
| 16. „ A. J. Leech. | 40. Rao Bahadur A. M. Murugappa Chetti- |
| 17. „ C. Nicholson. | yar. |
| 18. „ A. E. Rencontre. | 41. Mr. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 19. „ C. E. Wood. | 42. „ B. Obalesappa. |
| 20. „ S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad. | 43. „ C. Ponnuswami Pillai. |
| 21. „ D. Appavu Chettiyar. | 44. „ K. Raghuchandra Bellala. |
| 22. „ Ari Gowder. | 45. Rao Bahadur P. Raman. |
| 23. „ S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | 46. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 24. „ P. K. S. A. Arumuga Nadar. | 47. „ P. Sagaram. |
| 25. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. | 48. „ J. D. Samuel. |
| 26. „ N. Devendrudu. | 49. „ K. Sarvarayudu. |
| 27. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Tyagaraya Chetti- | 50. „ K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| yar. | 51. „ R. Srinivasan. |
| 28. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 52. „ Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. |
| 29. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 53. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti |
| 30. Mr. P. V. Gopalan. | Nayudu. |
| 31. Mr. B. Mahabala Hegde. | 54. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 32. Rao Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Nayudu. | 55. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. |
| 33. The Zamindar of Kurupam. | 56. Mr. K. Venkatachala Padayachi. |
| 34. Mr. V. Madhava Raja. | 57. „ M. Ratnaswami. |
| 35. Hony. Lieut. Madurai. | 58. „ W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 36. Mr. T. Mallesappa. | 59. „ R. Veerian. |
| 37. „ P. N. Marthandam Pillai. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. | 23. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 2. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 24. „ S. Satyamurti. |
| 3. „ T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 25. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. |
| 4. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 26. „ C. Maruthavanam Pillai. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 27. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 6. „ C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. | 28. Mr. G. Rameswara Rao. |
| 7. Mr. P. Siva Rao. | 29. „ P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. |
| 8. „ A. Chidambara Nadar. | 30. „ Venkatarama Ayyar alias V. Pantulu |
| 9. „ K. Koti Reddi. | Ayyar. |
| 10. „ J. Koppuswami. | 31. „ B. Venkataratnam. |
| 11. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | 32. „ Abbas Ali Khan. |
| 12. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. | 33. „ G. Abdulla Ghatala Sahib. |
| 13. Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. | 34. „ Abdul Hye Sahib. |
| 14. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 35. „ V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar. |
| 15. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. | 36. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib. |
| 16. Mr. P. Peddiraju. | 37. Mr. T. M. Moidoo Sahib. |
| 17. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 38. „ Muhammad Moosa Sait Sahib. |
| 18. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 39. „ T. N. Bava Ravuttar Muhammad Sahib. |
| 19. „ M. Seetayya. | 40. „ K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 20. „ M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 41. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. |
| 21. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 42. Mr. Janab Muhammad Yahya Ali Sahib. |
| 22. „ Sami Venkatachala Chettiyar. | |

Neutral.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 3. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 2. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi. | 4. Rai Bahadur Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu. |

59 members having voted *for* and 42 *against*, 4 remaining *neutral*, the Amendment was declared carried.

4-15 p.m. Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—“Mr. Deputy President, I take it, Sir, that my proposition has been practically defeated by the acceptance of the Amendment that has been brought forward just now. The very fact that Government benches solidly voted for the Amendment is an eloquent commentary on the fact that the Reserved half knows how to treat the Transferred half. What the exact effect of this Amendment is that the Government are asked to incur no further liabilities in regard to the British

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[12th December 1923]

Empire Exhibition. As the hon. the Minister for Development has practically said what the liabilities are that have been incurred already, my hon. Friend, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, is satisfied of having done something by introducing a verbal alteration in the original Resolution without having anything effective at all. But I do not congratulate him on his embarking on this unworthy attempt, because he torpedoed this attempt to give expression to the feelings of our countrymen without having the courage to face the House and tell the honest and manly truth, viz., that he wants us to take part in the Exhibition. This act of his getting behind and putting before the House something, as though there was some motive behind it, is certainly unworthy.

“Now, with great respect to the speech of my hon. Friend, the Minister for Development, I may say that he delivered his speech without any passion or feeling and in a most prosaic way and I must say this: that he failed in giving a proper lead to this House which he is bound to do. It is up to him, as being in charge of the Transferred Department of Industries, to have told this House whether he accepts the Amendment or not. I ask him in all seriousness whether it is a right thing that a private Member's Amendment should be allowed to be carried by the Ministerial benches, without the Minister rising in his place and saying ‘yes’ or ‘no’ even to the necessary question of my hon. Friend Mr. C. R. Reddi. Therefore I say that the Resolution is in a most mutilated form which will give no effect to the feelings of this country, because the only effect of this Resolution will be that no further liabilities which are necessary are to be incurred for the carrying on of the Exhibition. I submit that this is a most unfortunate thing and I do want this House to remember that, whatever we may do and whatever we may not do in this matter, the feeling of the country is absolutely settled on the matter. Some of those who may face their constituencies may say that they have done something with regard to this Exhibition in that the Government accepted the Resolution that no further liabilities shall be incurred. Some of us will go and say that they have done nothing—it is even worse under the present Resolution. I do therefore appeal to the House to remember whether it is right that a Resolution which was intended as an honest expression of honest feeling entertained by all classes of political parties, by all Indians, official and non-official, should have been treated in this fashion.

“Speaking on the Resolution by way of reply, I do not think I really can say anything in reply. My hon. Friend, Sir Reddi Nayudu, took up the strangest position, attacked with all the vehemence and with much greater eloquence than my humble self my Resolution, and, perhaps suddenly, when the voting time came, cold feet overtook him and he could not make up his mind one way or the other.”

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—“It is not, if I may say so, that I could not make up my mind one way or the other.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“This is not a point of order, Sir.”

Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—“It is not a point of order. But it is a question of personal explanation. I was charged that I could not make up my mind. I did not make up my mind because I thought that it was not the proper time and that I might give my vote when the next question came up.”

At this stage, the hon. the President took the chair.

12th December 1923]

MR. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I was under the antiquated impression that the time when a man could give expression to his opinion for a certain question was at the time of voting for that question, and not in advance or afterwards. However, I am thankful to my hon. Friend, Sir Reddi Nayudu, that there are opinions which hon. Members can entertain but which are not to be expressed at the time of voting ; and I hope I shall never practise it myself.

“ Apart from that, I want this House to understand that the way in which this Resolution has been changed simply means this : that no further liabilities ought to be incurred by the Madras Government with regard to the British Empire Exhibition. Now with regard to the past expenditure, the hon. the Minister for Development began by giving us some figures, but apart from these figures which are an eloquent commentary upon these great liabilities, viz., that they have collected already about Rs. 54,000 or about that sum from the Exhibitors for the space allotted to the Madras Court in the British Empire Exhibition, and that we have to pay ‘ a good round sum ’, whatever that phrase may mean, I do not think he has given us any good idea as to what it is meant by saying that no further liabilities will be incurred. But on the main question, Mr. President, I challenge the Minister to give this House an idea as to what is the profit in rupees, annas and pies which he expects if he advises the House to vote for the Exhibition. I venture to submit that he has given us no answer whatever.

“ If there is any doubt in any part of the House as to the object of the British Empire Exhibition and that it is intended for any material benefit to India, I shall, with your permission, Sir, quote a few sentences from the speech which the hon. Sir K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu delivered when he moved a Resolution in this House in September 1922 regarding the British Empire Exhibition. This is what he said :

‘ Even persons occupying the highest places and expected to know more about the affairs of this land seem to be under the impression that the people of this country are something which they are really not. I can only mention one thing, namely, that the heart of this country is sound as sound as it ever was and as it ever would be. Impressions seem to have gained in England that something is wrong with the people of this land at least a portion of it. I do not deny that there will always be elements which will move in peculiar groove . . . And if only to show to England that we are all right, that we are loyal to the core (whatever that phrase may mean) and that the people of this country are prepared to stand by the Empire and as part of the Empire, I say it is necessary that we should take part in this Exhibition.’

“ After this pronouncement, Mr. President, it is hypocritical of any one to suggest that our participation in the Exhibition is certainly not for expressing our loyalty, but for getting rupees, annas and pies. Surely this attempt to get us to participate in the Exhibition in a half-hearted manner or full-hearted manner simply means that you are willing to wound but afraid to strike. I really do not know what I am to do just now. I am in this peculiar position. I am not willing to vote on this Resolution one way or the other. I shall only resume my seat and I leave to the Members of this House either to accept the Resolution or reject it. For myself, I am absolutely indifferent as to the fate of the Resolution inasmuch as it has been torpedoed. I do not influence any one in this House to allow this Resolution to be carried, so that they may say they have done something. They have done nothing and the world knows that the Madras Council in this matter of national honour and dignity stuck to their old antedeluvian opinions and did not give their honest vote on this national question. I shall only suggest to hon. Members on this side of the House, if I may be so presumptuous as

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[12th December 1923]

to advise, to keep themselves neutral and leave the Ministerial benches to carry this ineffective Resolution. It will deceive nobody except themselves, and not the wide world at all."

Mr. Samuel then rose up to speak.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Has not the hon. Member already spoken ? "

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—" He spoke of course on the Amendment."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Mr. Satyamurti closed his speech. It is the reply and the final reply. Does the House want to continue the debate."

Voices of 'no' 'no'.

4-30 p.m. A poll was then taken on the amended Motion, with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. the Raja of Panagal. | 21. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 2. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 22. Rao Bahadur A. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |
| 3. " Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai. | 23. Mr. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 4. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | 24. " K. S. Ponnuswami Pillai. |
| 5. " Ari Gowder. | 25. " K. Raghuchandra Bellala. |
| 6. " S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 26. " P. Raman. |
| 7. " P. K. S. A. Arumuga Nadar. | 27. " A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 8. " A. V. Bancji Rao. | 28. " P. Sagaram. |
| 9. " N. Devendrudu. | 29. " K. Sarvarayudu. |
| 10. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 30. " K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 11. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 31. " R. Srinivasan. |
| 12. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 32. " Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. |
| 13. Mr. P. V. Gopalan. | 33. " J. D. Samuel. |
| 14. " B. Mahabala Hegde. | 34. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 15. Rao Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Nayudu. | 35. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 16. The Zamindar of Kurupam. | 36. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. |
| 17. Honorary Lieut. Madurai. | 37. Mr. K. Venkatachala Padayachi. |
| 18. Mr. T. Mallesappa. | 38. " M. Ratnaswami. |
| 19. " P. N. Marthandam Pillai. | 39. " W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 20. " B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 40. " Virappa Chettiyar. |

Noes.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. H. Tireman. | 5. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 2. " C. R. T. Congreve. | 6. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 3. " A. J. Leech. | 7. Rai Bahadur Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu. |
| 4. " C. E. Wood. | |

Neutral.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. E. W. Legh. | 17. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimharaju. |
| 2. " C. Madhavan Nayar. | 18. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 3. Dr. John Mathai. | 19. " A. Chidambara Nadar. |
| 4. Mr. P. L. Moore. | 20. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 5. " G. F. Paddison. | 21. " J. Kuppuswami. |
| 6. " J. A. Davis. | 22. " P. Anjaneyulu. |
| 7. " C. Nicholson. | 23. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 8. " D. Appavu Chettiyar. | 24. Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 9. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 25. Dr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 10. Mr. B. Obalesappa. | 26. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 11. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. | 27. Mr. P. Peddiraju. |
| 12. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 28. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 13. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 29. " J. A. Saldanha. |
| 14. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 30. " M. Sitayya. |
| 15. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 31. " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 16. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 32. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |

12th December 1923]

Neutral—cont.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 33. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar. | 43. Mr. Abbas Ali Khan. |
| 34. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 44. „ G. Abdulla Ghatala Sahib. |
| 35. „ S. Satyamurti. | 45. „ Abdul Hye Sahib. |
| 36. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 46. „ Hamid Sultan Marakkayar. |
| 37. „ C. Maruthavanam Pillai. | 47. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib. |
| 38. „ U. Rama Rao. | 48. Mr. T. M. Moidu Sahib. |
| 39. „ G. Rameswara Rao. | 49. „ Muhammad Moosa Sait. |
| 40. „ P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. | 50. „ J. N. Muhammad Sahib. |
| 41. „ Venkatarama Ayyar alias Pantulu Ayyar. | 51. „ K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 42. „ B. Venkatarama. | 52. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. |
| | 53. Janab Muhammad Yahya Ali Sahib. |

40 voted *for* and 7 *against*, 53 remaining *neutral*.

The Motion (No. 8), as amended, was declared carried.

When the result of the poll was declared, Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI rose up and said :—“ Mr. President, can the neutrals have it if they are in a majority in regard to the voting on this Resolution ? ” (Laughter and cheers from Opposition benches).

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ May I say, Sir, that armed neutrality has been successful ? ”

Since Mr. Rameswara Rao's Motion No. 12 on the agenda was identical with that of Motion No. 6 which had been postponed for further consideration to the 13th December, it was not taken up.

IMPROVEMENT OF WORKS OF IRRIGATION IN NELLORE DISTRICT.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, I beg to move :—

9. *That this Council recommends to the Government to take special steps for the improvement and extension of works of irrigation in the Nellore district.*

“ Before I take this Council into a detailed consideration of some of the irrigation projects affecting the Nellore district, I think it is but proper that I give an idea as to the extent of irrigation facilities in the district at present. After giving an idea to this House of the extent of irrigation facilities in my district and after giving an idea of some of the irrigation projects which have been under consideration at least since the publication of the report of the Irrigation Commission of 1901-03, I will try to place before this House certain problems which stand in the way of the carrying out of the irrigation projects, with the full hope that the hon. the Member for Irrigation will be in a position to find adequate remedies to deal with such difficulties. So far as the Nellore district is concerned, it covers a very wide area of about 8,000 square miles without adequate provision for irrigation and I shall show presently that the cultivated area in the district is much less than the presidency average either in results or in respect of provision for irrigation facilities. At present, it will be found, that so far as this district is concerned, out of a total of 51 and odd lakhs of acres, the cultivated area is about 12·90 acres which works out only to 25 per cent of the total area as against the presidency average of 42 per cent. If we take into account the area commanded by works of irrigation, it is only 6 per cent as against the presidency average of 8 per cent. Again, if you take into account the extent of lands irrigable, it is only 5·8 per cent as against 7·9 per cent for the whole presidency. Among the main irrigation works in the district, apart from some minor works, the most important are what are known as the Pennar River